TEACHERS COLLEGE RECORD

STATES' RIGHTS AND EDUCATION
R. Freeman Butts 189

SELECTIVE EDUCATION VERSUS EDUCATION FOR ALL
George Z. F. Bereday 198

FREEDOM, CONFORMITY, AND UNIFORMITY
Glenn Austin 207

PATTERNS OF FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION
David G. Scanlon 213

AMERICAN PRAGMATISM AND EDUCATION IN REVIEW
H. Gordon Hullfish 227

REGISTER OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS 233

BOOK REVIEWS 236

JANUARY 1957

TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

TEACHERS COLLEGE RECORD VOL. 58, NO. 4, JANUARY, 1957

The TEACHERS COLLEGE RECORD is issued eight times a year, monthly except June, July, August, and September. The subscription price is $4.00 per year; foreign postage, 50 cents. Single issues are sold at 75 cents each. Publication offices, 1407 Sherwood Avenue, Richmond, Va., and 525 West 120th Street, New York 27, N. Y. Editorial and general offices at the latter address. Printed in the United States of America. Second-class mail privileges authorized at Richmond, Virginia. Copyright 1956, by Teachers College, Columbia University. Microfilm copies of Vols. 55, 56, and 57 are available. For details, write to University Microfilms, 313 N. First St., Ann Arbor, Mich.

EDITORIAL STAFF

MAX R. BRUNSTETTER, *Editor*
LAWRENCE A. CREMIN, *Associate Editor*
JEAN B. TANNER, *Production Editor*

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

ARNO BELLACK
JOHN L. HUTCHINSON
ANNE S. MCKILLOP
RAYMOND PATOUILLET
E. EDMUND REUTTER, JR.
FRANCIS SHOEMAKER
EUGENIA K. SPALDING
KENNETH D. WANN
SLOAN WAYLAND

BUSINESS MANAGER
HAMDEN L. FORKNER, JR.

The TEACHERS COLLEGE RECORD aims to present stimulating reading for educational workers interested in broad professional competence. Today the teacher, the counselor, the school nurse, the administrator—everyone in education—needs insights and facts from many areas of professional activity. It is hoped that the reader, whatever his specialty, will constantly find in these pages ideas he can put to good use.

Articles in THE RECORD do not represent a single point of view. Fruitful thinking comes often from the challenge of opposing ideas. Therefore the opinions of the contributors are not necessarily those of THE RECORD editors, and are not intended to reflect institutional policy.

IN WONDERFUL

NEW

REVISED EDITIONS

GRADES 1-3

Many new stories in every reader - all of the same high quality as before

Entirely new illustrations in full color

More provision for the individual child

Workbooks bright with color

Manuals with more help than ever for the busy teacher

Books for Grades 4-8 and Enrichment Readers also available

GINN and COMPANY

Home Office: Boston - Sales Offices: New York 11

Chicago 6 Atlanta 3 Dallas 1 Columbus 16

San Francisco 3 Toronto 7

New McGRAW-HILL Books

TOWARD BETTER PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT

By HAROLD W. BERNARD, Oregon State System of Higher Education. New Second Edition. 466 pages, $5.50.

Revised and updated, this new text presents the practical principles of positive mental hygiene, citing the psychological justification of the principles. Emphasis is on the application of mental hygiene principles to help individuals achieve efficiency, happiness, harmoniousness, and fullness in their daily living. Part I deals with the meaning and significance of mental health. Part II stresses the problems of college students in studying, thinking, achieving personal and psychological satisfaction, and making mature, constructive social adjustments. Part III shows how the adjusting process continues after formal school life.

GETTING THE MOST OUT OF COLLEGE

By MARGARET E. BENNETT, Pasadena City College. In press.

Here is a nontechnical, challenging text specifically written to help college freshmen get oriented and make the most of their college years. Orientation to the college campus and community, the faculty and student body is discussed, along with such topics as participation in college life; development of effective leadership techniques; and personal adjustment and development.

HOW CHILDREN LEARN: An Educational Psychology

By ARDEN N. FRANDSEN, Utah State Agricultural College. McGraw-Hill Series in Education. In press.

A text specifically designed for prospective elementary school teachers. Develops an integrated theory of learning, which will increase understanding of how children learn and improve skills in guiding children in learning. The book begins with a discussion of objectives toward which children should strive. It then considers the kinds of learning activities by which these objectives can best be obtained, followed by an integrated theory of learning. It is a thorough effort to apply the background of the science of learning, as contributed by psychologists and educators, to more effective teaching.

PRINCIPLES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

By PAUL R. MORT and DONALD H. ROSS, Teachers College, Columbia University. McGraw-Hill Series in Education. New Second Edition. In press.

Revised, expanded, updated . . . this new edition presents a comprehensive treatment of the underlying principles of school administration derived from the objectives of education and from the common sense of culture. It shows the bearing of these principles upon all aspects of administration—personnel problems, curriculum problems, finance problems, school-building problems, and legal problems. Questions and exercises are carefully selected to provide a laboratory development which will give the student a growing understanding of the synthesis.

Send for copies on approval

McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, INC.
330 West 42nd Street New York 36, N. Y.

VOL. 58, NO. 4 JANUARY 1957

TEACHERS COLLEGE
RECORD

States' Rights and Education

R. FREEMAN BUTTS

PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION AND DIRECTOR OF DIVISION OF FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION, TEACHERS COLLEGE*

We Americans have traditionally had the comfortable feeling that education is above and beyond politics, but we can no longer escape the clear fact that education keeps pushing itself insistently and uncomfortably into the center of public attention. It is now in the middle of politics as it has never been before.

This fact should not be startling to those who have kept abreast of developments in American life and education during the postwar period, but the uncertainty, confusion, and controversy surrounding education have been highlighted in recent months and they promise to be in the center of the stage in the months ahead.

* Professor Butts is also head of the Department of Social and Philosophical Foundations at Teachers College, chairman of the Faculty Section on Higher Education, and chairman of the All-College Committee on International Education.

In July, 1956, the Federal aid to education bill was defeated in the House of Representatives after a complicated parliamentary debate in which segregation, civil rights, religion, and the private-school issue were all mixed up with partisan politics and economy drives.

The Supreme Court recessed for the summer under bitter attack for infringing on states' rights in its decisions on desegregation in schools and on sedition procedures in the states. Manifestoes by Southern Senators and Representatives called for curbs on the Supreme Court, maintenance of segregated schools, and opposition to civil-rights legislation. The Administration's civil-rights bill died in the closing week of Congress, to the evident relief of some members of both parties.

On the other hand, civil-rights groups hammered away at both parties with demands for stronger civil-rights planks in

their platforms for the campaign—and education was their chief concern.

The Democratic nominees for President and Vice President criticized the Eisenhower Administration for a weak stand on desegregation in the schools and supported the Supreme Court's decision, but the Southern delegations at both conventions tried to soften the civil-rights pledges, and with some success.

In the course of the political campaign each presidential candidate tried to fasten upon the other party responsibility for killing Federal aid in the previous session of Congress. Both candidates dealt with education as an issue of high priority in their domestic programs. With the opening of the new session of Congress in January, education is bound to reappear upon the national political stage with renewed intensity.

To make matters worse, our domestic record of confusion and uncertainty is now a matter of international concern. Some months ago, when a prominent Soviet educator challenged the United States to a competition in the field of education, *The New York Times* reported that there was no United States response to the Soviet suggestion.

At a time when America's status in the world may well depend on our educational, cultural, and economic policies as well as our military and diplomatic relations with other countries, it behooves the American people to become very clear about public decisions in education and politics. Moreover, what we decide in the near future may determine for years to come the fate of the American public-school system and, indeed, the nature of American society itself.

With the world's eyes on us, we face these four inflammatory educational issues: desegregation in the public schools, the relation of private and public schools, the role of religion in education, and Federal aid to education. My main point is that these four issues are interlocked and must be viewed as parts of a single problem. What we decide regarding one will have serious repercussions for the others. Together, these four bitterly fought issues add up to one of the central political questions of our time: What are the rights of the states with respect to education? Unless we answer this question definitely and conscientiously, in accordance with the best of our traditions, we will only contribute to the confusion and uncertainty.

STATES' RIGHTS AND SEGREGATION IN SCHOOLS

Racial segregation in American schools dates from a time when some states prohibited the instruction of Negroes or required that they be taught in separate schools. An early challenge to separate schools for Negro and white children arose when the case of Roberts *vs.* City of Boston came up in the Supreme Court of Massachusetts in 1849. Charles Sumner argued that separate schools for Negroes violated the Massachusetts Constitution's declaration that all men are born free and equal and have certain natural, essential, and unalienable rights. The court, however, decided that the races should be segregated and that schools could be separate yet equal.

This "separate but equal" doctrine was later affirmed by the United States Supreme Court in Plessy *v.* Ferguson in 1896. During the past twenty years the Supreme Court, applying the Fourteenth Amendment, has required several states to provide equal facilities for Negroes in institutions of higher education, but in doing so the Court did not disturb the basic doctrine.

Finally, in 1954, when the Supreme

Court faced squarely the "separate but equal" doctrine, it just as squarely rejected it on the grounds that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal and deprive Negro children of equal educational opportunity. Segregated school systems were thus declared unconstitutional under the injunction that no state could deny to any person the equal protection of the law guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. This means that Federal authority can limit the powers of the states over education when the principle of *equality* is involved.

Now, several of the Southern states are trying desperately to find ways to avoid or nullify the Supreme Court's ruling. Some states have started procedures to abolish their public school systems, to create private corporations that may continue segregation, and to give public funds to these corporations to carry out their purposes. The idea of a free private-school system has thus been designed to replace the American tradition of a free public-school system.

In 1956 Virginia, for example, amended its Constitution so that local school districts might decide for themselves what to do about segregation. If a district wished to abolish its public schools, it could do so, and the state would pay the tuition of all children to attend private and segregated schools. If, on the other hand, a district wanted to maintain desegregated public schools, it could do so, but those parents who wished to receive state funds to aid their children to attend private, segregated schools were entitled to them.

It is interesting to note what was involved in the court case which led to the amendment of Virginia's Constitution. In November, 1955, the Supreme Court of Virginia, in Almond *v.* Day, ruled that under Virginia's Constitution as it then stood, the state could *not* pay tuition or maintenance grants for children to attend private schools.

Here was a case brought on by the *private-school* issue. Most of the winning argument rested on a historical analysis of the religious and *church-state* issue. The real but unstated purpose, however, was to avoid *desegregation,* and the question of *Federal aid* was in the background. This illustrates precisely my main thesis: that all four of these educational issues are now closely interrelated and must be considered as part of one problem.

If we permit the use of public funds to establish free private schools to maintain segregation, we will destroy our ideal of a genuinely free and equal system of common schools open freely and equally to all children, irrespective of race, color, creed, or national origin. The common, or public school, has been part of the American tradition for the past one hundred years. If we try to maintain the separation of children according to race, by dividing them among private or sectarian schools, we run the risk of creating still greater divisions among us along class or religious lines.

STATES' RIGHTS AND PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The first colonial laws in Massachusetts, in 1642 and 1647, stated the principle that education of children was necessary for the benefit of the commonwealth and the church. The church was included because it was then considered part of government, as established by law.

These early laws expressed the view that parents were *not* free to let their children go uneducated, but that government had the right to set up schools

or exert its authority to provide the education that would protect the state from mischief as well as benefit the individual.

Private schools, as we know them in the United States today, generally appeared from fifty to one hundred years *after* town-supported schools and government-licensed teachers were in the field. The eighteenth century, not the seventeenth, witnessed their real growth. These schools, whose corporate existence continues beyond the lifetime of a single teacher or owner, are creatures of the state. They derive their powers and rights by delegation of authority from the state in their corporate charters. After all, the state grants the authority by which a private, corporate school teaches. It is not the private corporation or a church that grants the state the right to conduct schools.

Today the Federal Government has limited the power of the states over private schools. This limitation was first defined in the Dartmouth College case in 1819. In that case, the Supreme Court ruled that the State of New Hampshire could not alter the corporate charter of Dartmouth College and change the College from a private to a public corporation, because its charter was a contract whose obligation could not be impaired by the state under the United States Constitution.

The Dartmouth College case is thus properly taken as a charter of freedom for private, corporate educational institutions. But too little attention has been paid to the fact that this case asserted that if "the funds of the college be public property," then the state legislature *could* have exerted control over Dartmouth College.

Perhaps the private-school people who today want public funds for their own use, but do not want state control, should look at this case again. I believe it means at least this—where public funds go, public control may follow.

It will be well to keep the decisions in two other historic cases in mind—Meyer *v.* Nebraska, in 1923, and the Oregon Case, in 1925. These are taken to mean, and properly so, that parents may have a say in the education and upbringing of their children.

The most famous passage in the Oregon Case is this:

> The fundamental theory of liberty under which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations.

Perhaps a prior passage in the Oregon Case should now become equally famous:

> No question is raised concerning the power of the State reasonably to regulate *all* schools, to inspect, supervise and examine them, their teachers and pupils; to require that all children of proper age attend *some* school, that teachers shall be of good moral character and patriotic disposition, that certain studies plainly essential to good citizenship must be taught, and that nothing be taught which is manifestly inimical to the public welfare.

The decision in Meyer *v.* Nebraska had earlier been even more definite on the point that no challenge had been made of "the states' power to prescribe a curriculum for institutions which it supports."

So Dartmouth, Meyer, and Oregon all set limits on the states' powers over purely private schools. The states cannot eliminate qualified private teachers or abolish private schools, and they can-

not require all children to attend public schools. I believe this is a wise and sound part of our tradition. But I think these cases can also be read to mean that if the states *support* private schools, they take on one vital characteristic of public schools and *can* then be controlled by the state. Their teachers, their curriculum, and their facilities can be regulated, supervised, inspected, and examined by the state. If the private schools be religious schools, and most of them are, we then face the problem of the separation of church and state.

STATES' RIGHTS IN RELIGION AND EDUCATION

A key issue in recent years has been the meaning of the clause in the First Amendment which reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." Many have contended that this simply means that there shall be no single established church in the nation, but that the Federal Government and state governments may cooperate with all churches on a non-discriminatory basis.

The proponents of this point of view hold that no special privilege or preference can be given to one church or religion, but if all churches and all religions are treated fairly and equally, then the states may aid the churches, either by financial support for their religious schools or by helping them to promote religion in general through the public schools.

Others have argued that our historic tradition means that the Federal and state governments must be separated from the churches to the extent that government may not aid one church, several churches, or all churches, even though all are treated equally. The state as a civil agency must remain neutral with respect to religion in general as well as with respect to any specific religion.

My own reading of history is something like this. For nearly one hundred and fifty years, from the latter part of the eighteenth century to the early twentieth century, there was a fairly recognizable and steady movement away from state-established religion toward separation of church and state. By the beginning of the twentieth century, this movement to protect religious freedom included two widely agreed-upon principles: first, that public funds should not be used to aid religious schools, and, second, that there should be minimum attention to religious instruction or observance in the public schools.

Before 1950, the Supreme Court, in the Everson and McCollum cases, accepted the historical interpretation which I believe to be accurate: that the principle of separation widely prohibited the states from giving financial aid to religious schools or promoting religion through the public schools.

The Court has made an exception in the case of public funds for free textbooks and transportation of children to parochial schools by bus. The grounds for these exceptions are that these services are simply public-welfare benefits to which all children are entitled.

In the last half dozen years, however, the argument for greater cooperation between church and state has gone through a subtle change. The dominant argument for cooperation now rests on a generalized historical assumption that "We are a religious people," or "We are a religious nation," or "Our institutions presuppose a Supreme Being." It is therefore argued that it is legitimate for public education, as an agency of the state, to promote a generalized belief in God.

I believe it is an unwarranted leap of

logic and of history to say that *because* we are a religious people or a religious nation, *therefore* our *government* rests on religion.

Let us look again at the Zorach case, hailed by some religious groups as a change of heart by the Supreme Court because it permitted released-time religious instruction outside schoolbuildings in New York City. To be sure, Justice Douglas said in the decision, "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being." But he also distinguished between "we as a people" and "we as a government" when he said, "Government may not finance religious groups nor undertake religious instruction nor blend secular and sectarian instruction or use secular institutions to force one or *some* religion on any person."

This surely defines government and public schools as secular institutions, and Douglas said further that government must be neutral. "It may not thrust any sect on any person," he wrote. "It may not make a religious observance compulsory." And he added that it may not coerce or persuade students to "take religious instruction." In view of this, can we possibly use the schools to encourage belief in God or promote religion among the people without persuading students to take religious instruction? I think not.

If the states cannot promote religion, what shall we say of *Federal* funds for the states? Can Federal funds be used by the states to promote religion, or aid private schools, or maintain segregated schools? I believe not.

STATES' RIGHTS AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Our traditional assumption has been that education should be under state control, rather than Federal control. This is a long and commonly accepted tradition. It is one of our strongest assurances against the potential excesses, uniformities, and rigidities of a highly centralized system of education for the whole country.

There is wide agreement that the failure of the Constitution to specify education as a power of the Federal government reserves education to the states, or to the people, under the Tenth Amendment. The states have certainly acted on this principle, for in time every state has put in its Constitution provisions that require the legislature to establish and maintain a public school system. The body of court decisions raises no substantial question about the rights of states to undertake the educational enterprise as an integral function of state government.

But now two extraordinarily important questions arise. The first is this: Granted that the states have the right to conduct public school systems, are they free, in every and all respects, to conduct their public school systems as they see fit? The answer is now clearly No. The states do not have unlimited power over education within their jurisdiction. The states' power over education is limited in those arenas where the Federal Government has power to protect the *liberty* and promote the *equality* of all persons in the United States.

The Federal Government acquires this power from the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution: Neither the Federal Government nor state governments can deprive any person of life, *liberty* or property without due process of law, nor deny him the *equal* protection of the law. This limit on the rights and powers of the states in educational matters, then,

has had to do principally with the three questions of segregated, private, and religious schools.

The second question is: Can the states legally abolish their public school systems? This question is important for obvious reasons. The fate of our public-school system is now at stake as some Southern states threaten to interpose their powers between the Federal Government and the people of their states to avoid the Supreme Court's order to end segregation in their public schools.

Some of the states are now saying, "If we can't conduct our public schools in the way we wish, we won't have any public schools at all."

Must a state operate a public-school system for its people? *Can* a state abolish something it has the *right* to maintain, but no longer *wishes* to maintain? Does a state have the *obligation* to conduct a public-school system as an essential function of its very nature as a government?

If a state can abolish its public-school system by amending its Constitution, what other governmental functions can it abolish? Its parliamentary forms? Its free elections? Its courts? Its police? Are public schools as essential to a free government as these other functions, without which it is no longer a free government? These and similar questions are as fundamental to our political theory and practice as any I can think of.

Here again, I believe we must look at the obligations as well as the rights of states with respect to education. Here again, we need to re-examine the United States Constitution to see what obligations the Federal Government may lay on the states with respect to what they *should* do to promote freedom and equality, as well as the things that they *cannot* do, lest they infringe on freedom and equality.

Can we say, for example, that the guarantees of liberty and equality in the First and Fourteenth Amendments can be interpreted to mean that the Federal courts or Congress can require the states to maintain public education if we are to protect and promote liberty and equality in our society? I hope so, but this raises serious questions relating to the means by which such requirements could be enforced.

Or, what about Article 4, Section IV, of the Constitution, which reads, "The United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government?" Can this be interpreted to mean that the Federal Government can require the states to maintain public school systems, without which they are no longer republican in form?

Historically, we can show clearly that the founders of the public-school systems, in the nineteenth century, argued well that a republican government *did* require a public-school system if it were to promote freedom and equality. The states accepted this view when they incorporated public-school systems into their constitutional structures.

But what if the states now decide to go back and repudiate their historic tradition? Can the Federal Government say to the states, "Oh, no you don't. This is an irrevocable commitment, and Article 4 obligates Congress and the Federal courts to see that you do not take this step"?

Again, I hope so, but even if the legal question were clear, the problem of political and moral enforcement would remain. It should be remembered here that Congress has already required all states admitted to the Union since 1876 to make irrevocable provisions in their constitutions for a system of public schools, free from sectarian control.

I do not pretend to know the final answer to these questions, and some constitutional lawyers say that they are purely academic, not subject to judicial interpretation, but I think the problem is now so important that we should be aware of the range of alternatives.

If the issue comes to a showdown, and I hope that it does not, we can simply say, at one extreme, that the principle of states' rights permits the states to abolish their public schools, for the Federal Government has no power to prevent it. Or, at the other extreme, we can amend the United States Constitution, giving Congress clear power to require the states to maintain public schools. Or, we can give to Congress, by amendment or statute, the power to establish a Federal system of public schools wherever they are not genuinely maintained by the states, as was proposed in the nineteenth century. These alternatives do not sound very likely or palatable.

I believe it would be better if the Constitution, as it stands, could be interpreted by the courts to mean that the states cannot legally abolish their public-school systems. I believe it would be still better for all concerned if the people of the states and of the nation could be persuaded that our historic traditions should be honored and that all the states should and must maintain public-school systems based on liberty and equality.

As a step toward clarifying our national policy and achieving common agreement, I propose that the following principles should be the basis for solving the problems of states' rights and education:

1. States have the right and power to establish public schools, but this right is limited by the Federal Constitutional concern for liberty and equality.

The principle of liberty requires that public schools must be free of sectarian religious control and must not promote sectarian religion; even the effort to promote religion in general is a threat to the religious freedom of some. Public schools should not be hostile toward religion in particular, nor should they promote religion in general.

The principle of equality requires that public schools do not discriminate against or segregate pupils on the basis of race, creed, religion, or national origin. In other words, public schools must be common schools, freely and equally available to all.

2. States cannot create a monopoly for public education by destroying private schools, nor can they create a monopoly for private schools by undermining or destroying their own public schools.

The principle of freedom works both ways: properly approved private schools are free to exist and parents are free to send their children to them; public schools must be maintained by the states to give a common, free, and equal education to all.

3. States can and must have the right to support public schools by general taxation to assure that a good education is available freely and equally to all.

But states should not have the right to use public funds to support segregated, private, or religious schools, either directly by grants to the schools themselves, or indirectly by grants to pupils or parents as aid in attending such schools. Once financial grants by the states are made to private schools for *some* purposes, there is no reasonable place to stop—short of undermining the public schools themselves. Undermining or abolishing our public-school system contributes to undermining representative government itself.

4. States can and should have the right to exert considerable control over their public-school systems, but our experience has shown that it is desirable for the states to delegate considerable freedom and initiative to local school units in the actual day-to-day management of schools.

Our experience has also shown that equality of opportunity can be jeopardized by delegating too much freedom to local districts to do as they please. The states must therefore exert over-all authority to preserve freedom and achieve equality of opportunity throughout a state.

States also have considerable power to exercise control and supervision over private schools, but our experience again has shown that such control should be kept to the minimum necessary to guarantee that private schools serve the principles of freedom and equality and meet minimum educational standards. Granting public funds to private schools would warrant state control of private schools.

5. The Federal Government does not have the right to exert direct control over state schools except to protect the principles of freedom and equality, as already indicated. On the other hand, our experience shows that, while the Federal Government does not have the right to manage state school systems, it does have the right and power to give financial support to the states for their public schools, to enable them more fully to enhance the liberty and the equality of educational opportunity in the nation as a whole. Federal aid should not go to segregated, private, or religious schools for the same reasons that state aid should not go to such schools.

These principles, I believe, point to the best of our historic traditions of states' rights in education and give fair guidance for the fulfillment of our highest aspirations for a democratic society based on freedom and equality.

These are principles we could be proud to proclaim to the world as distinctively American. With full faith and confidence in their right and justice, we could welcome educational competition from any source.

Selective Education Versus Education for All*

GEORGE Z. F. BEREDAY

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, TEACHERS COLLEGE

SOME months ago there appeared in better magazines an advertisement of a life insurance company. It presented two pictures of a teenage boy in contrasting life situations. The first picture carried the caption "Will he be the *kid who left school . . .* to whom *doors are closed* even before he begins?" and showed the boy trudging along dejectedly, presumably on his way to work. Wearing a leather jacket and clutching toolboxes, badges of his working-class status, he marched on sadly, the target of laughing comments by some young bystanders. The second picture bore the caption ". . . or a boy who's sure of getting off to a good start in life, whatever happens?" and depicted the same youngster, now seated in the classroom, smiling happily, wearing a white collar, a tie, and a tweed jacket (now the badges of his status), doing presumably what youngsters crave most in life, copying material into a notebook. The message to fathers, of course, was clear.

THE TWO THEMES

This advertisement is a symbol of one important and basic theme in America—education for a career. Here, as in many other countries, education is expected to give status. Through education one seeks position and social advancement. Through education one hopes to become the boy or girl "most likely to succeed." Education is an economic investment. It enables people to get ahead and "make good." High grades as against indifferent ones, sixteen years of schooling as against twelve—these are items immediately rewarded by good or bad placement opportunities. Education is thus a channel of social mobility. It establishes expectations. It earns one material and social rewards. In the words of that oracle of homely wisdom, the New York cabdriver, "Nowadays, if you haven't got eddication, you've got to live by your wits."

Side by side with the theme of striving for a career, however, American education embodies another major theme. It is a public service, a privilege and duty of all. Every day millions of youngsters leave their parents, the traditional and natural agents of education, and under penalty of the law appear in public buildings, to be instructed by public servants in subjects which the public deems appropriate. Education is for all; not a triangle, narrow at the apex, in which the less well suited are thinned out, but a rectangle in which all partake. It is a free

* Professor Bereday, who teaches comparative education at Teachers College, Columbia, is completing a book on *English Education and Social Status.*

public institution. It does not wage a battle of social justice, like the selective systems of other countries, to change the nineteenth century principle of selection by ability to pay into the now postulated principle of selection by talent. The United States is a pioneer in one-stream education for all. While countries like Liberia strive for simple achievement of fundamental education for all,[1] or like Turkey attempt to enforce primary education for all,[2] or like England battle for secondary education for all,[3] the United States long ago accepted the principle of a high-school diploma for all and is moving into the era of universal college education.

In practice much remains to be done in American secondary education, as long as the compulsory laws in many states do not apply beyond the age of sixteen, and as long as only some 65 per cent of all adolescents do, in fact, graduate from high school. But the ideological problems of education for all have now been shifted beyond high school. With thirty out of every one hundred Americans attending college and with the prospect of this number doubling within twenty years, the problems of whom to admit or what policy to follow in hitherto small private universities occupy an increasing share of public attention. Education for all from childhood to adulthood is becoming a universal postulate which the United States is already implementing and to which the rest of the world is beginning to lend an increasingly attentive ear. For it may well be that education for all is responsible for the miracle that "with only 6 per cent of the world's land and 7 per cent of its population the United States publishes 27 per cent of the world's newspapers, owns 31 per cent of all radio and television sets, produces 40 per cent of all electrical power, uses 58 per cent of the world's telephones, and drives 76 per cent of its automobiles."[4] It may well be that maximization of individual opportunity has released tremendous dynamic forces and that the sum total of free individual efforts has mobilized productive energies striven for in vain by totalitarian planners. Education for all, more than education for a career, has been this country's pride and strength.

THE PROBLEM

But how can these two profiles exist side by side? If on one side education is to supply careers, and on the other it is to encompass all, how is one to reconcile the two? Are *all* going to make a career? Are all going to become school superintendents, college presidents, professionals?

There is profound and tragic incongruity between the two themes. One remembers what happened in Weimar Germany, when the vast numbers of school and college graduates were unable to find jobs commensurate with their expectations. One can see what happens in Japan or India, where the United States and Britain introduced their respective systems of education only to confront those who graduate with prospects of jobs as street-sweepers. And one is daily witnessing what happens in the Soviet Union, where over and above the

[1] David G. Scanlon, "Fundamental Education in Liberia, West Africa," *Teachers College Record*, November 1953, pp. 70-76.

[2] Abdul H. K. Sassani, *Education in Turkey*. Bulletin 1952, No. 10, United States Office of Education.

[3] G. Z. F. Bereday, "The Problem of Social Equality in English Education," *Harvard Educational Review*, Summer 1953, pp. 228-42.

[4] Henry H. Armsby, "The Manpower Situation in Engineering and Science," p. 3. An address given before the Sixth Thomas Alva Edison Foundation Institute, November 21, 1955. Mimeographed report.

much-publicized reports about the large output of professionals,[5] the regime never ceases to appeal to its young to enter industrial or agricultural work instead of continuing to press for admission to already overcrowded universities and institutes. It is plain that disparities between the demand and supply of educated men only serve to create a class of dissatisfied intellectuals, and history contains much evidence that dissatisfied intellectuals are notorious leaders of unrest and revolution.

Fortunately, on the manpower level of analysis the United States has not been troubled by the contradiction between its two dominant educational profiles. It is one of the very few countries which could reconcile education for all with education for status. It could do that for two reasons. First, owing to the growth of its population and economy, the "room at the top" has been steadily expanding. More children must mean more schools, more teachers, and more superintendents. Larger demand for refrigerators has meant more producing plants, more plant managers, more vice presidents of manufacturing companies. But the mere fact of the expanding room at the top can be greatly overrated. What matters is clearly not mere expansion, but expansion in keeping with the output of qualified graduates. Sufficient expansion could never be maintained to satisfy the volume of output of education for all. Reliance on the expansion of room at the top alone could soon produce most formidable bottlenecks.

The second reason seems much more relevant. While the room at the top expanded, the bottom level of occupations has at the same time steadily risen. Elbridge Sibley has pointed out that much of the apparent social mobility in the United States has been due to the general upping of the character of technological occupations.[6] The immigrant who became a pushcart fruit peddler, sent his son through public grade school to become a truck driver delivering fruit to a supermarket. His grandson, having finished high school, appears as a skilled mechanic servicing fruit automats. The character of the occupation, distribution of fruit, changed little. But, thanks to education and technology, the social status of the occupation has been notably upgraded. A third-generation American looking at the increasing educational opportunity for all and at his own success within it can congratulate himself on the apparent harmony with which these two seemingly contradictory principles have operated to his advantage.

But on the social level of analysis the United States is not immune to the cleavage between education for status and education for all. Striving for careers creates emotional attitudes and psychological drives that cannot be left out of consideration in planning a system of education for all. In particular they can seriously obstruct the operation of one of the basic goals of education for all—the proposition that education serves as a tool of social equality.

EQUALITY AND EDUCATION

Social equality, through its unfortunate connection with early Soviet Communism, has recently come in for a lot of abuse. Arguments that it cannot be

[5] G. Z. F. Bereday, "American and Soviet Scientific Potential," *Social Problems*, January 1957.

[6] Elbridge Sibley, "Some Demographic Clues to Stratification," *The American Sociological Review*, June, 1942, pp. 322-30. Reprinted in L. Wilson and W. L. Kolb, *Sociological Analysis* (Harcourt, 1949), pp. 642-50, and also in R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset, *Class, Status, and Power* (Free Press, 1953), pp. 381-88.

achieved, that it leads to standardization and loss of freedom, are now common occurrence. But what was meant by social equality in American education was in reality quite a working proposition. For equality is a static concept, while American schools have operated instead on a dynamic principle of not equality but equalization. The persistent neutralization by the schools of social distinctions which naturally arise over a period of generations has proved a worthy ideal. This equalization through education has been accomplished in two ways: the schools have been promoters of social mobility, and they have been agents of reduction of social distance.

The first function, that schools should be agents of social mobility, is well known as equality of opportunity. If the school is a channel through which youngsters flow, the equality of their opportunity implies the openness of the channel. An open school system serving an open society means that irrespective of other considerations such as religion, race, ethnic origin, economic well-being, or social status, youngsters with aptitude for high-status occupations should be able to find their way to these occupations. "Schools free men to rise to the level of their natural abilities. . . . By providing a channel for ambition, they have taken the place of the frontier, and in a highly technical era have preserved the independent spirit of a pioneer nation. The schools stand as the chief expression of the American tradition of fair play for everyone, and a fresh start for each generation."[7] The many familiar facets of American education now in force are an explicit instrument to prevent the creation of barriers to mobility. Merit and achievement (albeit somewhat nebulously defined and identified even more poorly) are supposed to be the only admissible criteria of appointment and promotion. Education is to keep the flow of talent unhindered. This has been its first equalizing function. A high degree of circulation of social newcomers among the older elite groups was bound to create an atmosphere of equality and fluidity that has since become a matter of national pride. Whereas in Europe it is one of the major concerns of self-made men to conceal their origin, in the United States, boasting of humble background is an honorable habit which few captains of industry can resist.

The second equalitarian function of schools has been even more significant. It has to do with bridging social gaps between people. Most old-type social structures could be drawn in the form of a triangle: a few very well-to-do or otherwise privileged people at the top, a more numerous middle class, and the majority at the bottom—an industrial or agricultural proletariat. This is a familiar Marxian profile. But the American social structure can no longer be drawn in this way. Rather it is a diamond shaped structure with the majority not at the bottom but in the middle. The task of the schools has been to place an increasing number of people in the middle, sometimes by an overt catering to the average (much criticized, especially by the people at the top), more often by lifting and incorporating the people from the bottom into the middle class. American schools, like the American economy through its anti-trust laws, income and inheritance taxes, welfare policies, and price controls, are supposed to be continuously pounding the top and the bottom of the diamond in order to flatten it out.

[7] The Committee for The White House Conference on Education, *A Report to the President*, April 1956, p. 4.

As a result social distances are remarkably reduced in the United States. There are few outward class symbols, and fewer still that cannot be acquired on an open market. Relatively slight emphasis is placed upon the distinctive accents, clothes, haircuts, manners, and tastes that separate the European elites from the rest of their countrymen. It often amazes foreigners to observe the first meeting between two Englishmen. They appear to be so very much reserved, withdrawn, and on guard. This is so because when two strangers in England meet they maneuver for position; they must "place" each other. They must establish the common ground which will enable them to associate in a free and relaxed relationship of equals, or they must "keep their distance." In the United States, by contrast, there is hardly any distance, and consequently there is more friendliness, relaxation, and joviality, although sometimes more vulgarity perhaps. Most people live in a similar type house, drive the same type automobile, eat the same quality of food, enjoy the same pastimes. There are no fences, any child or dog can wander onto one's lawn. In Europe only most refined of dogs would be so admitted. Nowhere else does one catch a glimpse of a plumber entering a forty-room house of a millionaire, looking around, shrugging his shoulders and commenting, "Nice place you've got here." And nowhere else can one find a letter such as appeared in *Time Magazine* after it featured an article on American intellectuals:

SIR,

Why the fuss over the intellectuals? Most of them are laggards who think the world owes them a living. I am just a die-caster who owns a $14,000 home with a swimming pool in the backyard and a new Buick. Who's smartest—me or them?

The pliability of the upper class in the United States is remarkable, but much more so are the pride, independence, security, and outspokenness of the common man, who refuses to be cowed or pigeonholed by his social superiors. It is the common man, here a member of the middle group, who makes up the much courted and much reviled American public. This public, far from accepting consistently social or intellectual leadership from anyone, imposes upon the rest of the nation its own code of morality. In Europe, the upper classes dictate cultural mores to which all others must adapt themselves; hence the upper classes enjoy much greater freedom. In the United States, the upper social groups must submit to the middle; hence they are much less free and more prone perhaps to criticize American culture for conformity. When comparisons are made at the level of the common man, however, one is impressed by the relative freedom of the American—his political strength, the economic choices available to him, his command of transportation and communication, and his intellectual alertness.

Education for social equalization is responsible for much of this. As long as it maintains the flow of mobility and reduces social distance, it can serve harmoniously the theme of education for all and even that of education for status. It does not matter much who makes more of a career if all succeed according to their merit, and if the social positions reached are after all not so very far apart. Thus the equalitarian factor in American education has been strong and successful. Education has been thought of as a safeguard against undemocratic abuses. In particular the principle of common school has served to implement this goal. There are some stirring words

in the works of Horace Mann and of the early mid-western writers on education indicating that they thought the common school particularly well suited to the continued maintenance and preservation of social equality. The American melting pot is an unusual example of people who in European surroundings would shudder at the very mention of each other's nationality, living together in relative peace and harmony. Different religious and economic groups, too, are relatively free from tensions which characterize them in other countries. It has justly been asserted that the common school has contributed to this achievement. Mixing together of rich and poor, bright and slow, strong and weak children has created a common experience and greater social harmony. Getting to know one another has had the effect of reducing unjust stereotypes, prejudices, and grievances.

This is America's heritage. One may not wish to perpetuate it. One may feel that our schools were inherited from European prototypes and that they have wandered too far away from these prototypes. One may call the equalitarian tradition, as some sociologists now call it, the American "myth" or the American "dream." Or one may prefer to believe, as this writer does, that it is the American ideal. Be that as it may, the equalitarian role of the schools is a fact of history, a source of America's strength in the past and an inseparable part of American culture.

This historic function of education can also be a theme of the future. Technology and education are more capable than ever of effecting a wholesale revolution of the occupational prestige patterns. A waitress, for instance, occupies a low-status position. Hers is a poorly paid, transitory occupation with low admission standards and little prestige. But require this same girl to have a high-school diploma, put her through "charm school," give her a smart uniform, and add the romance of flight, and you have an air-stewardess; essentially a waitress, yet a semiprofessional, with a function far transcending the simple labor of waiting. The same principle can be demonstrated with garbage men. In some American cities garbage is still collected in open trucks. In those cities the job of garbage collecting recruits many marginal people, mental and psychological misfits. But take a garbage man in New York, have him operate from a white incinerator truck, dress him in a uniform and a cap such as distinguishes policemen, and call him a sanitary engineer and you have an entirely different occupation.

Education can give the charwoman the status of cleaning lady, a janitor the status of building superintendent. The girl who took home economics courses using most modern equipment will not be content with the potbellied stove. The boy who has lived in an ultramodern college dormitory will not settle for an unpainted shack and outdoor plumbing. Education for all has tremendous potentialities. Something, somewhere will rub off on the student. The memory of the school will trigger his efforts. It will enable him and, through his influence, his children to remake their lives in terms of completely new and better criteria. The equalitarianism inherent in this process of uplifting leaves less and less room for the belief that one's gifts, one's achievements, or the mental rather than the manual character of one's occupation, set one above and apart from one's fellow men. As R. H. Tawney used to say, superior brain, like superior beauty, is an accident of birth and im-

poses obligations rather than conferring privileges.

INEQUALITARIAN TRENDS

And here lies the problem. For it is at this point that education for status clashes with education for all. If the latter theme implies equality, the former implies inequality. Deep down, in spite of tradition, in spite of professed ideals, people are not equalitarian. In their public and private roles people act differently and in contradiction. And when put to a final test their private motives always seem to win. One is reminded of George Orwell's telling phrase: "All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others." People like distinctions and enjoy feeling superior. Not only wives, and not only the psychologically insecure search for status symbols; everybody looks for them. If no criteria of distinction are available, people will invent them. In England, where postwar Labor reforms brought about substantial economic and some educational equalization, there has recently been a resurgence of class snobberies amounting to almost comic proportions. Thus a series of articles edited by Nancy Mitford[8] set off a minor explosion not only about U (upper class) and Non-U (non-upper class) word usages (such as American "black tie" and "tux") but also about such unlikely principles of social discrimination as the "rather m. i. f." denotation. It appears that if you put *milk in first* in your teacup, that makes you Non-U.; tea first testifies to your aristocratic origin. In the United States, too, in the absence of important class distinctions people sometimes attach social values to most peculiar symbols. Thus in California, where the possession of a swimming pool is now so common as to be no longer distinctive, what matters most at present is its shape, those with heart-shaped and elliptical pools claiming high social precedence. On the eastern seaboard, on the other hand, where the ethnic floods make it hard for anybody to be somebody, people will go to some length to secure a distinctive three-number license plate for their cars. People like inequalitarian symbols. They really care more for admission tickets to exclusive social groups than for an equalitarian system where no such tickets are required. Nobody seems to mind social discrimination and exclusivity, provided that he himself is neither excluded nor discriminated against. To paraphrase Evelyn Waugh, everybody believes himself to be a gentleman, but everybody draws the line of demarcation immediately below his own heels.

What matters, however, is not so much that people search for inequalitarian status symbols, but rather that they search for these symbols in education. As the equalitarian temper of our time abolishes the old criteria one by one, more and more pressure is exerted upon education to find within it new social compensations. For a growing number of occupations, the road to a superior career increasingly leads through schools. Without education fewer and fewer people can fulfill their ambitions by entering directly politics, business, or even the theater. Thus there is a constant search in education not for equality but for socially invidious symbols. Only selective, discriminating education can satisfy those craving social distinction. Academic degrees, culture and refinement, intellectual acumen, these are worth little if everyone can possess them. The

[8] Nancy Mitford (ed.), *Noblesse Oblige: An Inquiry Into the Identifiable Characteristics of the English Aristocracy* (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1956).

more one succeeds, the less one is prone to accept the "cheapening" of one's achievements which universality seems to bring about. Thus the pattern of education for all is under constant attack. Simple diversification, natural and laudable in all educational activity, becomes ground for cultivating old and new patterns of snobbery. Intricate prestige hierarchies of schools and colleges, the pecking order among teachers according to rank and function, the run on the paperbacks, not for their intrinsic value but as social symbols for intellectual name droppers, or even "inverted snobbery," all these carry symptoms of persisting search for status. "The knowledge that one's parents ate and still eat in the kitchen," writes Margaret Mead, "can jeopardize the pleasure with which a university professor enjoys the rosy candlelight and the old linen at the college president's table, and can give an enormous relish to the discovery that the college president's wife's father kept a garage."[9]

As American education comes of age, the evidence of these tensions increases. Equality and snobbery are now fighting a perpetual battle in the schools. The concern of the great depression for Proper Bostonians and Babbitts has been almost completely replaced by the contemplation of the High Brow, Low Brow, and Middle Brow, and of the Man in the Gray Flannel Suit. It is obviously not enough to assume that the abolition of elite education in the past has forever settled the question. The new education carries within it the seeds of new elitism. Even the popular pressure for education that has been the historic strength of the common school has been partly generated by motives inequalitarian in character. In an excellent passage the editors of the *Yearbook of Education* describe the operation of these motives in an area that comes perilously close to home for the readers of this journal.

> Within the American university one can detect signs of prestige hierarchy. There was a time when the theologian, philosopher, or historian looked with some misgiving upon those who worked in physical, chemical, and biological laboratories. Science seemed a smelly, manual, pragmatic sort of occupation. Now it is accepted, and the natural scientist in his turn has been somewhat sceptical of the economist, psychologist, sociologist, and anthropologist attempting to claim the mantle of academic respectability and scientific sanctity with their "social studies." One thing has tended to unite the old and the new: the appearance of an even less "academic" intruder, namely the professional educationist.
>
> The school of education, in spite of the fact that it trains for the largest single profession in the United States, is often looked upon as hardly more than a "trade school," offering pompous and verbose lectures on the most absurdly minute fractions of the teaching process. Variations of Shaw's famous quip that "he who can, does; and he who can't, teaches [and he who can't teach, teaches teachers—my variation]" are quoted in disparagement of the mushrooming activities of such schools. Schools or departments of education are now at least two generations old and with this maturity has come a differentiation of the status-strata even within their highly specialized ranks. Thus the professor of philosophy, or history, or sociology, or psychology of education cannot quite believe that a professor of educational administration or curriculum or methodology is really as "academic" and hence as acceptable as he is. And all these probably secretly consider their studies to be intrinsically somewhat above those of professors of folk dancing, or swimming, or making a salad.[10]

[9] Margaret Mead, *And Keep Your Powder Dry; An Anthropologist Looks at America* (Morrow 1942), p. 64.

[10] R. K. Hall, N. Hans, and J. A. Lawerys, "The Social Position of Teachers." *The Yearbook of Education*, 1953, p. 16.

It is perhaps understandable that older elite groups resist the idea of education for all as a crackpot scheme. It cannot be pleasant to see oneself deprived by events of long-practiced modes of life and established expectations. The very intellectuality of the older groups has rendered them contemplative and thus unable to withstand the competition of determined, active, newer groups. But one must account also for these newer groups. The rising groups which once protested against the educational barriers set against them by superior social groups suddenly undergo a change of heart as soon as they themselves succeed in crossing these barriers. All at once they try to blend assiduously with the groups which were once their rivals and become staunch upholders of the very restrictions against which they once protested. There is a persistent temptation to those who have climbed the ladder of educational success to try to kick it over from above. People behave in education like a man who pushes his way violently into an overcrowded trolley car. Yet the minute he himself gains a foothold, he joins in shouting to those still struggling to get aboard, "Full up, no more room!"

That is why Lawrence Cremin half-jokingly named this the "trolley-car theory of education." There is a point at which education, formerly a channel of opportunity, becomes a block to opportunity. The agent of social mobility becomes an agent of social insurance. As the success of equalitarian education means that increasing numbers succeed in reaching superior social status, there is always the concomitant danger that those segments of public opinion hostile to equalitarianism in education will also be strengthened.

Can the pressures for intellectualization of American public schools and the accompanying criticism of progressive education be adequately understood without taking account of the social nature of these pressures? Can the cry for "education of leaders" and the many proposals for separation of "the gifted" be properly appraised without examining the possible social motives behind them? The demands for return to a two-stream educational system, the use of public money for private schools, ethnic and racial difficulties, reluctance of the colleges to enlarge admissions—these and many other crucial current problems ought to be examined in the light of the cleavage between education for equality and education for status. No reform of education, no decision of policy, can be successfully carried through if it does not take into account these persistent stratifying tendencies. It must be a constant concern of educational theorists committed to the preservation of the American heritage not to advocate viewpoints which consciously or otherwise serve as "fronts" for these motives. Sincere educational endeavors must not become prey to those forces which under the masquerade of concern for democratic education attempt to advance inequalitarian and elitist concepts to the detriment of the nation as a whole.

Freedom, Conformity, and Uniformity*

GLENN AUSTIN

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, ARIZONA STATE COLLEGE

Much has been said and written recently concerning the problem of freedom and conformity in American life. There has been, however, a tendency to overlook the fact that the problem is both a social and an educational one, and that these two aspects of the problem are closely interrelated. Moreover, there has apparently been either an unawareness of or an unwillingness to recognize the relatedness of conformity and educational uniformity. Yet it is in pressures toward social *and* educational conformity *and* uniformity that we may find the greatest danger to democracy in our time.

DEMOCRACY AS AN OPEN SOCIETY

The many definitions of democracy which have been attempted have served to bring out various aspects of a very complex concept. We seem to be at a stage in our national history when one particular meaning of democracy, that is, democracy as an open society, is of extreme importance. A democratic society needs to be an open society, dedicated to its own self-improvement by peaceful means. This much, of course, seems acceptable to all believers in democracy. But let us fill out this concept of an "open society." The word "open" means that the possible ways of improvement are open also. A democratic society is not one which must conform to any prescribed, predetermined pattern. It is a society which emphasizes participation of all its members in developing the values to be cherished (in that society) and in selecting the most desirable of the alternative directions for social change. And perhaps most important of all, the criteria for what is improvement and what is desirable are determined by the members of the society. A democracy, then, must be vitally concerned with the method or the means by which this open society can continue to be open; can continue to improve itself by peaceful means. This does not mean that we disregard our past, our ideals, or our democratic ancestors and traditions; but it does mean that neither the traditions nor the ancestors prescribe a rigid pattern. This, it seems to me, would make sense to such ancestors as Jefferson, Washington, Lincoln, and Tom Paine.

This conception of an open society means that we must have unfettered expression and communication of opinion and belief. Such freedom is widely accepted in theory but not so widely practiced. We must stop operating on the principle that bad ideas will drive out

* Professor Austin has been a member of the faculty of the State College at Tempe, Arizona, since 1950. He is particularly interested in the relationship between philosophy and education, and is a Fellow in the Philosophy of Education Society.

good. Milton, Jefferson, and Mill all agreed that freedom of expression must be preserved and that if truth and error were both expressed, truth would always win. Censorship, then, it is argued, is evil in a democratic society because it prevents us from discovering what may be *the* truth, under the guise of trying to protect us from error and heresy. This makes an irrefutable argument against censorship and other limitations on freedom of thought and expression. But in an open society, such limitations are an even greater evil because they prevent us from using the method by which the participants in a society, both groups and individuals, become aware of all the possible solutions to social problems coming from the various areas of society, and then work out the *best* truth in light of all these possibilities.

All things which interfere with freedom of thought and expression in an open society are thus chopping away at its self-improvement potentialities. The self-realization of an open society is dependent upon the operation and expression of free intelligence in all areas of living. It should be obvious that in this kind of society diversity is precious. Diversity becomes a value, because from the many diverse individuals and groups and minorities within society we receive more and more ideas as to possible desirable directions of social development. Each group tends to see the social welfare from its own point of view, but out of these various points of view we are able to work out together what is best for our society. The best answers to our problems are not all already known and waiting to be discovered; they are to be worked out in the democratic process. As an open society, democracy cherishes diversity because it recognizes that therein lies its capacity for self-improvement, and in freedom of expression and communication lies our guarantee of *peaceful* change.

In the last few years all of us have become aware of the pressures being exerted against diversity and against the principle that we need free expression of all points of view, that we need a free, critical intelligence exploring all areas of life. We have heard derogatory, derisive comments aimed at many intellectuals in our society, at men of education and ability, men of recognized intellectual achievements who have been maligned and slandered by political and journalistic commentators who seem to believe that higher education, unusual intelligence, humaneness, and good will are undesirable qualities for citizens in a democracy. Much of this contempt has been crystallized into that scorn-filled epithet, "egghead." Throughout our land we have seen much of the attitude displayed in the following lines from an old Jewish poem:

> Leave fantastic dreams alone
> And mind no business but your own,
> For what has been must be.
> Nothing the wisdom of old surpasses.
> Our fathers were wise and their
> children are asses:
> Eternal *their* laws, beyond question or
> doubt,
> Our business is only to carry them out.
> For what has been must be.

The causes for these recent pressures against diversity and free intelligence are numerous. Certainly the anxieties and tensions resulting from our trying to live democratically in a world in which there is also a totalitarianism devoted to conflicting values have been responsible for many of those excesses which we have come to label "McCarthyism." As a nation we seem to be partially emerging from the cloud that was cast over our

democratic values by the senator from Wisconsin, but there is no guarantee yet that even this particular battle has been won, even though the major figures may change. We are now being very quiet about McCarthy and acting a little sheepish because we feel he made a fool of us in the eyes of the world. Perhaps we have learned something. But we have not yet faced the even greater problem from which this one is only derivative.

THE BASIC PROBLEM

In David Riesman's much discussed book, *The Lonely Crowd*, which has the subtitle, *A Study of the Changing American Character*, there is a fascinating discussion of the change in the American character from the stage of *inner-direction* to the stage of *other-direction*. Other-direction seems on the way to becoming dominant in our country and may perhaps tend to become dominant in all countries as they reach a particular stage in their social development. Riesman's argument is too important and too complex for a hasty summary here. But what he has to say is extremely significant for the problems of uniformity and conformity, both in society and in education.

Increased education, leisure, services, mass communication, the shift from primary to secondary groups, have come with capitalism, industrialism, and urbanization. Out of this complex with its emphasis on socialized behavior and social adjustment has come the other-directed person, who is described in this fashion by Riesman:

> What is common to all other-directeds is that their contemporaries are the source of direction for the individual—either those known to him or those with whom he is indirectly acquainted, through friends and through the mass media. The source is of course "internalized" in the sense that dependence on it for guidance in life is implanted early. The goals toward which the other-directed person strives shift with that guidance; it is only the process of striving itself and the process of paying close attention to the signals from others that remain unaltered throughout life.[1]

We might say he is like a tremendous insect, perhaps like Kafka's great beetle, with extremely long antennae, always feeling his way, sensitive and receptive to every external pressure, so that his every action and thought are determined for him by his constant seeking of approval through conformity.

We need not push Riesman's analysis any further. *If* in a society like ours we are becoming more and more anxious about what all the others think and are trying only to conform to their pattern of expectation for us, then we are tending to become all alike. Such a process would be truly a vicious circle, with every individual trying to conform to a pattern of character and thinking dictated by the approval of *all* other individuals. Actually, of course, we would cease to be individuals in the full sense. A society established on this process would surely be doomed to complete uniformity with no individual diversity. Such a society would never produce a Thoreau or an Einstein or even our own ordinary individualities. A society in which everyone is striving to live up (or down) to the common denominator of all other persons' patterns is like a community in which everyone does nothing but take in everyone else's washing, even using the same brand of automatic washer and drier. There would seem little hope for any improvement in such a society, or indeed for *any* rationally directed social

[1] David Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), p. 22.

change. This, then, could not be an open society, capable of exerting any significant degree of control in the direction of self-improvement. This would be a society of the indiscernible, of the indistinguishable. It would seem to be trying to disprove Leibniz by producing individuals who are exactly alike, but it would ultimately be made up of the same individual, operating under different numbers.

To guard against being misunderstood I should emphasize that when I speak of individuality I am not referring to "individualistic free private enterprise" or to the unlamented "rugged individualism" popular during my youth. To those who insist that these are foundations for all forms of individuality and freedom I can only reply that they apparently are embracing the fallacies of strict economic determinism for which the Communists have been severely and rightly criticized. They are almost out-Marxing the Marxists, and someone might even label them un-American. Nor would I wish to argue that absolutely all conformity is dangerous; but a *reasonless* or *thoughtless* conformity *is* dangerous and is usually coupled with the idea that nonconformity in any form or differences in any degree are subversive and intolerable. I am of course primarily concerned about conformity in the realm of ideas, of beliefs, of values, and of attitudes toward social change. Is not our basic freedom, after all, the freedom to think and to make effective choices?

SOME EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Let us turn now to some of the implications of all this for education. Education and society are ceaselessly interacting with each other, each affecting the other. Social change is taking place, and education can react to it in at least three ways: (1) ignore it and thus tacitly approve it; (2) re-enforce social change indiscriminately; or (3) strive to help people to operate with an awareness of the alternatives available and what can be done about them. Today education is being criticized by those who would make a cult of uniformity and conformity. Academic freedom is frequently under fire *not* because it is an academic issue but because it is primarily a *social* issue, the right of free intelligence to explore, to criticize, to evaluate in all areas of life. This is dangerous to conformity of any kind, in education or in society. Loyalty oaths have been experienced almost everywhere. The Fund for the Republic has recently set aside a substantial sum of money for a study of the degree of fear existing among teachers. Lists of *verboten* books have been pushed upon school librarians, as in California, not so long ago. Textbooks have been dropped from use under pressure, or perhaps republished in "safe" conformity editions. We have seen infringements upon the civil liberties of teachers and all other citizens. We have seen anyone whose opinions differed from those of the majority becoming immediately suspect. Honest criticism, instead of being considered desirable, has been labeled disloyal. This story has been told many times; there is no need to repeat its details to any informed group.

Yet when one looks at the pattern of much of American education one is surprised at the extent and the intensity of these attacks. By and large, American education, particularly secondary and higher education, has operated under a philosophy which has emphasized the value of uniformity, of adjustment and conformity. Some have hoped that critical thinking and evaluation would be an

automatic and contradictory by-product, perhaps, but seldom has emphasis been placed upon them. Frequently education at all levels has been looked on as simply a matter of acquiring prescribed information. Too often, we teachers pour it in and "pour it on," and our grades merely measure how much of what has been poured into the student he is able to give back to us on our tests. We subject every student to the same standardized once-over-lightly, or not so lightly, treatment. We require the same of everyone. All this information, it is assumed, somehow becomes a part of the student and makes a difference in him. Perhaps it will make the same difference in all the students! Instead of the inquiring mind, then, we thus tend to encourage the merely receptive mind. In all too many institutions throughout the land we have so many students in classes that it is difficult to do anything except to pass out the information and fill their receptacle-like minds as full as possible. A friend once suggested to me this might be the reason some teachers affectionately refer to their students as "jugheads." Perhaps our educational efforts have been more successful than we think; perhaps we are reaping what we have sowed. Those people who are now criticizing education for not teaching enough conformity, along with all those who fail to become concerned about pressures for conformity are, by and large, products of that educational system just described. Perhaps some of education's chickens are coming home to roost.

In a short book, *The Cultivation of Idiosyncrasy* (1949), Harold Benjamin focuses attention on the big problem for education in a democratic society. He points out the absurdity of our idea of education as acquiring, adjusting, conforming. In trying to give everyone exactly the same educational experiences and the same material, testing them to make sure they know the right answers and can hand them back when the appropriate stimulus is presented—in all this, he says, we are in danger of reducing our society to a flat level of conformity and mediocrity. It may work well under totalitarianism, where people are told what to think, or in a society where change is almost nonexistent, but it will certainly not meet the needs of a society made up of individuals who need to think and evaluate for themselves and decide for themselves if, where, what, how, and when social changes should take place.

That kind of society needs citizens with individuality; it will prize diversity and idiosyncrasy. It needs individuals who have a sense of commitment to value systems which have been critically examined and which have stood up under that examination, and who recognize that others may not agree. It needs an educational system which appreciates creativity, individuality, and diversity; which encourages the free-ranging intelligence to examine all areas of life and all points of view. (Freedom of thought need not mean merely that we think as, when, and *if* we please.) It needs an education in which students work on real problems, in which there are genuine alternatives available, and in which students make real choices after a critical evaluation of alternative possibilities. It needs an education in which controversial issues involving conflicting value assumptions are brought out into the open and critically examined. It needs to recognize that anything worth believing in will welcome and survive critical examination. It needs to recognize that anything that will not survive critical examination is not worth believing in.

As Harold Benjamin remarks, our society needs only that conformity which the achievement of our greatest goals requires; ". . . and it requires just as many uniquely developed peaks of ability, just as much idiosyncrasy as the attainment of our goals will allow and need. . . . That society which comes closest to developing every socially useful idiosyncrasy in every one of its members will make the greatest progress toward its goals."[2]

CONFORMITY OR DIVERSITY

As a people we must decide how much conformity is necessary if we are to be strong (admittedly this is a problem) and how much diversity is possible to make for the greatest progress toward the goals we set up. A society which emphasizes diversity has great potentiality for self-improvement; its life has a richer texture, and its future guarantees individuality for all. We can gain only temporary strength through sacrificing diversity to conformity. The pressures of all our mass media toward uniformity and subsequent conformity in a society in which so many of us read the same papers, listen to the same radio commentators, watch the same television programs, listen to the same commercials—these pressures are almost overwhelming. Our problem is not one of obtaining conformity, but one of retaining individuality and diversity, even nonconformity, against all these pressures. I see no basis whatever for approaching this problem with a turn-of-the-century attitude of easy optimism, or a ready belief in the inevitability of progress and a guaranteed happy resolution of our difficulty. Education at all levels faces a serious challenge—the call to revise many of its practices in light of this long-range social need. If those of us who are aware of the danger use every opportunity *in society and in education*, we *may* be able to preserve that diversity without which continuous social strength is impossible in a rapidly changing world, and without which individuality must surely disappear. This correlation of individuality and an open society still exists as what William James would call a live option, that is, as a possibility which our strong faith and our determined efforts *may* perhaps make into a reality. The alternative to this is a static, uniform dead-level of conformity and mediocrity, with eventual loss of basic freedoms.

[2] Harold Benjamin, *The Cultivation of Idiosyncrasy* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1949), pp. 36-37.

Patterns of Fundamental Education*

DAVID G. SCANLON

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, NEWARK (N. J.) STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

Few decades in history have known such a determined attack on the problems of health, agriculture, and illiteracy in the underdeveloped† areas as that which has taken place during the ten years since the end of World War II. The realization that it is impossible to have universal peace as long as one half of the world lives in hunger and want has led to this vast program. The emergence of newly independent states has placed a heavy responsibility on their leaders to prove that with independence the standard of living in their countries can be raised. For assistance, the new leaders have turned to the United Nations, the United States, and such regional organizations as the Colombo Plan. Since the close of World War II, colonial powers have endeavored to improve the standard of living in the colonies, and each has its own approach to technical assistance.

Associated with the increase in forms of technical assistance are a number of terms used to describe the efforts made to improve standards of living: "Community Development," "Mass Education," "Basic Education"; and in 1946 UNESCO coined the phrase "Fundamental Education" to describe its proposed programs in less well developed societies. All of these terms are being used interchangeably in the daily press, and while they all are concerned with raising standards of living, there are differences in philosophy and emphasis. As this discussion is concerned with Fundamental Education, the differences must be examined.

FORMS OF ASSISTANCE IN UNDERDEVELOPED SOCIETIES

Mass Education and Community Development are terms often used interchangeably. These forms of assistance have been developed extensively by the British Colonial Service. The following definition of Mass Education was accepted by the Secretary of State of Colonies in 1948:

> A movement designed to promote better living for the whole community with the active participation of and, if possible, on the initiative of the community, but, if this initiative is not forthcoming spontaneously, by the use of techniques for arousing and stimulating it in order to secure active and enthusiastic response to the movement.[1]

[1] "What Is Mass Education?" *Mass Education Bulletin*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (December 1949), p. 2.

* Professor Scanlon is Director of the African Institute, which was established to encourage teachers to study Africa. He is also a member of the board of directors of the Comparative Education Society.

† The term "underdeveloped" has been used throughout this discussion for lack of a better word. It should not be interpreted as a description of a whole culture, as it applies to only segments of a culture.

Mass Education in British African colonies has been classified under four categories: Mass Education work as such undertaken by the government and carried on by propaganda teams, social welfare centers, and mass literacy campaigns; Community Development schemes undertaken by governments; various activities of governments, such as improved health measures and extension programs of agricultural departments designed to improve African farming and introduce new crops; and many forms of adult education for women.

Several years later T. R. Batten used the same definition for Community Development as that quoted above to describe Mass Education. Mr. Batten cited as his source the results of the Second Colonial Officers Summer Conference on African Administration, held in 1948.[2] It apparently was felt that the term Community Development described the efforts more adequately than Mass Education, for the *Mass Education Bulletin* published by the University of London Institute of Education changed its name to *Community Development Bulletin*.

Uganda offers an example of the demonstration team approach to Community Development. Teams were originally used in the country to recruit for the army. At present each consists of an African manager and six to ten members. Each team is supplied with a lorry and tents. The tours are arranged with the joint planning of the District Commissioner, local African governments, and the District Teams, which consist of specialists from various departments.

On reaching the village the team usually starts to develop interest by presenting a side show. Several exhibits are presented and each team member speaks for a few minutes about his particular aspect of the side show.

> This might consist of two live calves, one of which has been stall-fed and regularly deticked and the other neglected and in consequence suffering from malnutrition and East Coast fever. . . . A third lecturer might show photographs illustrating various stages of yaws and urge his listeners to attend for treatment in the first stage, when it is easily curable. The crowd is marshalled in groups for the demonstrations and cattle owners would be sent to the calf exhibitions, while mothers might be sent to a lecture on the feeding of infants. Every quarter of an hour or so the groups are moved from one demonstration to the next.[3]

After the side show the team presents an outdoor performance of plays, dialogues, lectures, singing, or quizzes designed to develop a learning experience illustrated in the side show. Following the performance the team helps the people work on some community development project and may spend a week to a month in a particular village.

Kenya has attempted to meet the problem of village improvement by appointing Community Development Officers. Each officer is in charge of a community center which has been built largely through the efforts of the local people. The centers have three functions: recreation, dissemination of knowledge concerning the government, and serving bases for the African Welfare Workers.

Typical work of the Community Development Officer is illustrated by this account of the tree-planting campaign in Muputi in Machakos District.

> The District Team put the Community Officer in charge of the education of the

[2] T. R. Batten, "The Community and Development," *Corona*, Vol. 3 (September 1951), pp. 330-34.

[3] D. E. B. Carr, "Demonstration Teams," *Corona*, Vol. 3, (April 1951), pp. 140-42.

people regarding the value of windbreaks and plantations to retain the moisture in the soil and reduce the desiccating power of the wind. The inhabitants were suspicious and conservative, they attributed the increasing desert conditions to reduced rainfall and thought that man could not put things right. After a campaign in which modern educational methods such as the cinema, news sheet and posters, and the ancient ones of discussion and teaching were used incessantly, the people were won around. On the appointed day, with almost a religious fervour, they embarked on their vast voluntary effort to plant half a million trees. . . .[4]

Community Development Programs are in operation throughout the world in various forms and under the direction of many different agencies. Examples are the National Community Development program of Greece, Pronoia dia tis Ergassias; the Thal Development authority in the Punjab Province of Pakistan, which has introduced irrigation in desert lands; the Paysannats Indigenes, a rural economic organization aimed at improving African agriculture in the Belgian Congo; the community school program of the Philippines; the Ejido rural cooperative communities of Mexico; the multi-purpose "centres of attraction" found in French Africa and the Dujailah Land Settlement program of Iraq under the terms of which a family may own sixty acres of land if they have successfully followed farming directives for ten years.

Basic Education is a term that was preferred by many educators, particularly Americans, following World War II to describe forms of assistance in underdeveloped societies. Unfortunately some confusion has arisen because Basic Education was the term used by Gandhi to describe the *schools* in which all education would center around a basic craft. In the plan developed by the Government of India, the teacher in the Basic Education School has community leadership responsibility, but the emphasis upon teaching a craft in school has been unacceptable to some educators. As a result, the term Basic Education is now seldom used except in reference to schools in India.

Fundamental Education is a generic term used to describe the process by which people are motivated to help themselves through community action. The demand for help must come from the people rather than being superimposed. Fundamental Education may be considered a process of awakening man to his potential for living a more healthful and rewarding life. It provides those basic skills necessary for improvement. It is organic in that it is molded to fit the needs of a particular community. It represents a combined attack on basic problems rather than a single campaign, for example, malaria control and Laubach's outstanding work in literacy.

Community Development may be thought of as the product of Fundamental Education. It is entirely conceivable for Community Development to take place without members of the community having those learning experiences that can be used for further development. For this reason, heavy emphasis is laid on "education" by UNESCO and other agencies concerned with assisting people in underdeveloped societies. While certain skills taught may provide the basis for improvement, the real education comes from people learning to work together and realizing that they have the power to improve their condition through cooperative effort. The underlying principle is that of "helping people to help themselves." If this prin-

[4] Tom Askwith, "Community Development in Kenya," *Corona*, Vol. 3 (June 1951), p. 220.

ciple is neglected, Community Development becomes stagnant—limited to the particular project being undertaken at the particular time. On the other hand, if the learning experiences in the process are emphasized and become evident to the people, then Community Development becomes dynamic and is a continual process of evolution with unlimited possibilities.

To the observer, the initial work in Fundamental Education may appear to be unfruitful. At the end of a year there may be no bright new schools and shining clinics. The effect on agriculture too may seem to be slight. Unfortunately it is much easier for governments and agencies to issue orders demanding that villagers construct buildings and attend health classes. Such an approach—and it is being used—gets immediate results and makes dramatic statistical tables.

The real test of the success of Fundamental Education comes, however, when the pilot project is completed and the villagers willingly undertake new projects. Success can be measured by the extent to which people meet to discuss common problems and work together to solve them. Fundamental Education places strong emphasis on the dignity of man and his ability to solve his problems if given assistance.

Fundamental Education takes into consideration the fact that the introduction of new values means a disruption of the old cultural pattern. For example, the building of a road connecting isolated villages with the larger cities may bring about a clash between the insulated cultural patterns of a rural community and the usually more Westernized city culture. Introduction of a clinic may weaken the power of local medicine men, whose function is closely interwoven with the religious thought of the people. In many instances the rapid deterioration of an old culture has left the people with little except the materialism of Western civilization.

Every effort is made in Fundamental Education to help people find new, desirable values to replace those that have been discarded. Unless this is accomplished, the end product can be community disorganization instead of Community Development. Here again is evidence that Fundamental Education emphasizes process rather than the purely material products of Community Development.

Reduced to its most basic concept, Fundamental Education is education for survival. It has functioned in areas with a high illiteracy rate, high infant mortality rate, and an inadequate agricultural system. From UNESCO's report on conditions existing in its Fundamental Education project area in Sirs-El-Layyan, Egypt, we learn that

> Seven or eight million men are working on the land in Egypt, and at least three million of them own the land they work. But most of them own less than a feddan (some one and a quarter acres), while the official minimum for supporting life is two and a half feddans. . . . Ninety-two per cent of them suffer from bilharziasas . . . 64 per cent of the rural population suffer from ankylostomiasis. . . . Trachoma affects about half the population.[5]

For this reason, Fundamental Education appears to be a better term than Community Development to describe the first stage of village growth in underdeveloped societies. The latter term has been used widely to describe many different types of activities. In the United States it applies, for example, to the work of the county extension services, the educational program of the Ten-

[5] UNESCO, *Sirs-El-Layyan* (Paris, 1955), pp. 6-7.

nessee Valley Authority, and the work of Berea College; in Canada it describes the Antigonish cooperative movement in Nova Scotia. While all of these programs are responsible for improving the lot of the people, the needs in underdeveloped societies are so much greater that it is hardly accurate to place them in the same category with those of people living in less well developed areas of the United States and Canada.

FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION AND FORMAL EDUCATION

Fundamental Education is an emergency measure to be used until the people have learned the skills necessary for leading a more healthful and economically self-sufficient life through cooperative effort. It lays the foundation for further development. While there are many facets of Fundamental Education, the village school is playing an increasingly important role. In the early days of Fundamental Education it was feared that "school" education might be considered the only way to meet the needs of the people, for formal education in many underdeveloped societies often followed a rigid syllabus similar to the syllabi used in the United States and Western Europe. Such syllabi were completely foreign to the culture of the indigenous people and, of even greater importance, ignored the basic needs of the people. For this reason, many educators at first looked with suspicion upon the idea of building more village schools. In addition there was the fear that adults would be neglected and that these schools would be thought of as the only medium for Fundamental Education.

In actual practice, there are now more village schools and they have become an integral part of the Fundamental Education approach. There are several reasons for this. In the first place, to the amazement of most workers in the field, the villagers demanded more schools for their children. If Fundamental Education proceeded on the philosophy of meeting *felt needs* of the people, then village schools would have a high priority on any project list. This is an example of the difference between what educators from highly developed societies think the people want and what the people actually want. It proves a fact that is being rapidly realized by Fundamental Education workers in the field: that one can approach an underdeveloped society with too rigid an idea of what the people are like and what they want in the way of assistance. Such a preconceived idea may be based upon recent published material by anthropologists and sociologists. Unfortunately for the worker, material is scarce and he may be relying on reports that are out of date. Underdeveloped societies are not static, and the actual structure may have changed between the time of the latest published report and the time the worker reaches the field. This fact has been particularly noticeable since World War II. The use of troops from the colonies, the declaration of the Four Freedoms, and the organization of the United Nations with its Declaration of the Rights of Man have had a profound impact on many underdeveloped societies. There is growing realization among the people that conditions can be improved through education. In most underdeveloped societies, missionaries no longer pay parents to send their children to school; now there is parental demand for and faith in education.

A second reason for using village schools is that, unless Fundamental Education is viewed as a permanent measure, the only way to insure introduction of new concepts necessary for the develop-

ment of the community is through the children. There was ample evidence that the village school, used correctly, could be one of the most effective means of bringing about village improvement. The success of the Community School movement in the Philippines and the Basic School movement of India provided a framework that could be adapted to the particular approach of Fundamental Education.

Another reason for using the village school as part of the Fundamental Education movement is the relatively high position held by the village schoolmaster. Additional training and orientation of the teacher to the Fundamental Education approach would produce a leader who would be available for all Fundamental Education projects. One method has been to train the teachers in established rural training colleges for village development. This is being done at Komenda College in the Gold Coast.[6] A second technique is to establish Fundamental Training Centers and train the teachers there. A third approach is that used at Bay el Arab in Egypt, where a teacher-training center is attached to the social center serving three villages. The social center serves as the focal point for all community improvement and the teachers are trained as leaders. In this respect there is a great similarity to the Nai Talim school founded by Gandhi in India.

Liberia provides an example of a dual school system. In addition to the established National School System, which represents an academic approach to education, there is the Fundamental Education school program located in the interior. The Fundamental Education schools are designed as four-year primary schools, and for the great majority of children represent terminal education. They also serve as community centers for health and agricultural workers.

[6] For a description of the Komenda program, see M. B. Lourenco Filho, L. A. Creedy, and others, *The Training of Rural School Teachers* (Paris, UNESCO, 1953).

APPROACHES TO FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION

Although Fundamental Education is a term coined by UNESCO to describe the process which underlies successful community development, it has been adopted by many government and non-government agencies to describe their work in underdeveloped societies. There are many variations and adaptations, but generally the Fundamental Education approach can be found in one of the following patterns.

1. Regional Approach

The first regional approach to Fundamental Education was developed by the Government of Mexico and UNESCO in 1951. The Fundamental Education Center was organized to train field workers for the Latin-American Member States of UNESCO and has been expanded to include the Organization of American States. Since its founding, the Center has been assisted by FAO, ILO, WHO, and the Organization of American States. After an extensive survey, the village of Patzcuaro was selected by UNESCO and the Government of Mexico as a typical Latin-American village. Here were all the problems of health, agriculture, and literacy that were common to all of Latin America.

Students were selected for the Center by their respective governments and UNESCO. Unless they had had some preliminary training, a great deal of time and effort was wasted. Therefore, those students who are selected as trainees are

already graduates of a teacher-training college, a technical school, or a university with a specialty in a field such as agriculture that would be useful in Fundamental Education. In addition, all students are expected to have had three years of rural experience. Upon arrival at the Center, national groups are broken down into international teams.

The course at the Center is nineteen months long and is divided into the following periods:

a. General introduction to theoretical and practical work in Fundamental Education (six and one-half months)

The first month the student is at the Center, an evaluation is made of his previous experience. Every effort is made to use whatever experience and education he brings with him, as a springboard to further understanding of the philosophy and development of Fundamental Education. An introduction is also given to such areas as rural sociology, rural economics, social psychology, social research, the production and use of audio-visual aids, health, printing, small industries, and pedagogy.

b. Field work (Nine and one-half months)

During this period the student spends his mornings in the workshops of the Center and his afternoons in one of the more than twenty villages associated with the Center, working as a member of a five-man team on a project. The students meet as national teams once a month to discuss how Fundamental Education can be applied in their own country. It is also during this period that students are required to live for one month in one of the villages.

c. Review and evaluation (three months)

During this final period students return to classrooms to evaluate and summarize the experiences they have had at the Center. Visits are occasionally made to other Fundamental Education projects in Mexico, but the majority of the time is devoted to seminars and the writing of theses.

Since its opening, the Center has had students from practically all of the Latin-American countries. Graduates have returned to their respective countries to help in the expansion of Fundamental Education. In some countries—Cuba, Honduras, and Venezuela, for example —they have assisted in the formation of National Fundamental Education Centers. Others have worked as members of teams or as leaders of projects.

Although the Center was organized for Latin America, students from Pakistan also have been trained at Patzcuaro. This fact is an example of the emphasis on process and approach used in Fundamental Education, for although the culture of a Mexican village is very different from that of the villages of Pakistan, the basic problems and the basic techniques to be used are fundamentally the same.

The success of the Latin-American Regional Center has led to the establishment of a Regional Center for the Arab States at Sirs-El-Layyan in Egypt. The two-year program there resembles the approach used at Patzcuaro. Emphasis at the Center is on subjects that are basic to Fundamental Education, such as health, literacy, and agriculture. The core of the entire program is a course in "village community and social change."

After an orientation course, the students visit social and educational institutions in the area. Some time is spent in getting acquainted with the villagers and gaining their confidence. This period is followed by one of actual project work during which the students work in teams in the villages attached to the Center. Each member of the team is an expert in some field of Fundamental Education and is expected to learn how other specialties are related to his field. As in Patzcuaro, experience in the workshops producing teaching aids and visual aids is considered an important part of the

program. Students from nine Arab countries have been trained at the Center.

2. *National Programs*

The most common pattern of Fundamental Education is found in National Fundamental Education Programs established by governments, such as that of the Government of Liberia and UNESCO. Under the terms of a joint agreement signed by these two, UNESCO would supply a team of experts in various fields of Fundamental Education. The Government of Liberia would furnish housing and transportation within the country for the foreign experts and would pay the salaries of young Liberians selected to be trained by the experts.

During the first year a pilot project was carried on. This was an exploratory period in which Fundamental Education was taught through the establishment of village schools. These schools were used as a means of introducing Fundamental Education because at that time the villagers considered schools to be the most urgent need, and because the schools offered proof of what could be accomplished by cooperative effort. It was obvious to the Government of Liberia and to UNESCO that an expanded Fundamental Education program could be carried on only by the establishment of a Center which would train Liberians in the various areas of Fundamental Education. The Center, which was completed in 1955, has the following objectives:

a. Training rural elementary school teachers and supervising the work of elementary schools in the Fundamental Education area
b. Training rural workers, community leaders, and women workers
c. Organizing Community Development (adult education, health programs, agricultural extension work, arts and crafts, and cooperative living)
d. Developing effective methods and materials for the teaching of reading, writing, and simple arithmetic to children and adults.

The men selected for training are given a one-year course, after which they are appointed by the government as rural workers in groups of four or five in the hinterland. They are responsible for teaching primary school children, conducting literacy classes for adults, and community development. Every effort is made to train the wives as well as the men at the Center so that the couple can work as a team. The need for educating women (in prenatal care and baby care, for example) is recognized as one of the major problems of the area.

The Center publishes materials in Gola and Vai, the two most commonly used languages of the area. In addition, it publishes materials in English to serve as a follow-up for literacy campaigns.

In Thailand a similar National Center has been established. The Thailand UNESCO Fundamental Education Center (TUFEC) places heavy emphasis on the techniques of research. The two-year course of study offered to students is similar to that of the Latin-American Center at Patzcuaro. The National Center requires that all students have thirteen years of education and two years of government service before being accepted. In this respect the requirements are more demanding than those of most National Centers and are very much like those of the Regional Centers in Mexico and Egypt.

3. *Bilateral Approaches*

In establishing boundary lines between countries, often little attention is paid to

ethnic groups. As a result, occasionally groups of people are bisected. This occurred in the division of the Ewe people between Togoland and the Gold Coast and the division of the Indians of the Altiplano between Bolivia and Peru. Artificial political boundaries mean little to a group who feel united by strong social and religious ties. Thus, efforts to work with part of a group in one country are not nearly so successful as plans which have disregarded political boundaries and have concentrated on the whole group.

The latter approach has been used by Peru and Bolivia in an attempt to raise the standard of living of the Indians of the Altiplano, a homogeneous geographical and social unit found in both countries. The needs of the Indians of the Altiplano were similar to those of many other underdeveloped societies. In addition to problems of health, agriculture, and literacy, the Indians did not speak Spanish and their own language had never been written. They were an isolated people having little contact with the other people of Peru and Bolivia.

In November, 1945, the Ministries of Education of Peru and Bolivia and a special representative of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs met for the purpose of organizing an educational program to be carried on for the people of the area. Those attending the conference felt that the best approach to the problem could be found through a village school whose curriculum would be fundamentally agricultural but would allow advanced education for those students who were intellectually superior. The school was thought of as a center to influence the home and the community as a whole.

At a second conference held in Bolivia the above objectives were reiterated, and improvement of health conditions, the encouragement of cottage industries, and the encouragement of the study of Spanish were added. It was also emphasized at the conference that the educational opportunities would be offered to both the child and the adult.

It was felt that supervision would be made easier by grouping the schools in small centers. Each center (Nuclear School) would consist of a central school and from fifteen to twenty sectional schools. To encourage village participation, central schools were established in areas where the Indians would donate the necessary lands and the physical labor for the construction of the school.

Each center is provided with a director and three teacher supervisors. One supervisor is an expert in agriculture and cottage industries; the second, in hygiene and rural sanitation; the third, in the teaching of Spanish. All supervisors are graduates of Rural Normal Schools and are proficient in one of the Indian languages. Teachers who have been selected are given a six-week course in agriculture, health, organization of parent–teacher clubs, and the preparation of reading material in Quechua and Aimara. In addition to helping the teachers in the sectional schools, the supervisors are expected to assume leadership in community development.

3. Non-Team Approach

The most common pattern found in Fundamental Education is the team approach. A team usually consists of four or five specialists in various fields. In some areas, however, because of the great demand for Fundamental Education and the scarcity of specialists it is difficult to have full teams. When this is the case, Fundamental Education is

carried on under the direction of one or two specialists rather than by a full team. While it is extremely unlikely that they will have all the competencies demanded by Fundamental Education, it is possible for them to start the process of cooperative effort. Once it is evident to the villagers and to the government what can be done cooperatively, more experts, if available, and increased financial aid will be needed.

Obviously this non-team approach places great responsibility on the one or two specialists. It is possible to remove a member of a full team who may not understand or be able to work with the village people and still carry on the work with the remaining specialists. The use of one or two specialists, however, means that the entire success of the project rests on the decision of one or two men. Their failure results not only in the loss of invaluable time but also in the lack of trust by the people. For the latter reason there has been some reluctance on the part of governments to use the non-team approach. In some instances, however, this method has had very favorable results.

One of the most successful projects carried on by only two specialists is in the Valle El General and the La Lucha district of Costa Rica. One specialist was an expert in primary education; the other an expert in rural education. Although the specialists believed it impossible to think of Fundamental Education without considering primary education, in the beginning heavy emphasis was placed on community meetings. Each village formed a Committee for Cooperation with UNESCO which served to identify both local and district problems. The success of the program can be attributed in large measure to the breakdown of parochialism and the realization that, while some problems can be solved at the village level, others require the cooperation of several villages.

The success of the work in the Valle El General and La Lucha has led to the expansion of Fundamental Education in other areas of the country. Costa Rica is benefiting from the Latin-American Regional Center, for her students are returning to take positions of leadership in the newly created Department of Fundamental Education.

4. Cooperative Efforts by Church-Affiliated Groups and by Governments

While missionaries in various countries have been undertaking responsibility in education, agriculture, and health for many years, within the past decade there has been a greater effort to approach village development and Fundamental Education by joint missionary–government effort. The Friends' Rural Center (Quaker) at Rasulia, India, is typical of such a joint effort. In addition to operating a Rural Development Cooperative Society, a dairy, and a boarding school for boys patterned on Gandhi's Basic School concept, the Rasulia Center has been opening other centers in near-by villages. The Nitaya Center, which has a primary school, a health center, and a community hall, is staffed by trained agricultural workers and a midwife. The midwife's salary is paid by the Kasturba Gandhi Memorial Fund. The teachers' salaries are paid by the Indian Community Development Project. By such coordination and sharing of expenses a pattern has been formed that is being used in many underdeveloped areas. Although there is great need for specialists, church-affiliated groups often have difficulty supporting the specialists, schools, hospitals, and agricultural stations in the field.

By joint planning and the sharing of expenses, governments and church-affiliated groups have been able to expand community services and Fundamental Education.

5. National Economic Development

While Fundamental Education is being pursued by many governments as a means of raising the economic and health level of villagers, in other countries it is considered an integral part of the total economic development of the country. Basic to the proposed plans for economic development of Egypt is an extended program of Fundamental Education. In India, Fundamental Education is viewed as a foundation for the development of the country. While a major objective in India is the actual material improvement of the villagers, an objective of even greater importance in terms of long-range development is to effect a change in the mental outlook of the people, instilling in them an ambition for higher standards.[7]

In India the idea of adult education limited merely to literacy was considered much too narrow, and in attempting to define the new education which would serve as a more accurate description of the proposed program, the term "Social Education" was coined. Social Education is the same as Fundamental Education. Those educators who were responsible for articulating education and the First Five-Year Plan for economic development felt that all forms of group activity—for example, village panchayats (councils), cooperative societies, and trade unions—would offer an opportunity for Social Education.

Community centers have been the major means of carrying out the plans for Social Education. The Central Government, under the Intensive Educational Development in Selected Areas Scheme, established five community centers, an integrated library service, and a Janata College[8] in each selected area. In each area the work in Social Education is associated with the particular economic and general development of the region.

The unit of development in the Community Development and National Extension Program is the development block which consists of one hundred villages with an estimated total population of 66,000. The goal of the First Five-Year Plan was to establish twelve hundred development blocks which would include a population of approximately 57 million people by 1955-56. By the end of 1954, approximately this number had been included in the development work and it is expected that India will reach the goal of 80 million this year. It has been estimated that the villagers have contributed (labor and land) about 60 per cent of the expenditure incurred by the government.[9]

Inasmuch as Social Education in India represents the combined efforts of practically all government agencies, it is difficult to isolate specific accomplishments and attribute them to Social Education. In this sense India, with its population of nearly 400 million, is making the greatest concentrated effort at Fundamental Education and Community Development in the free world. It offers proof that it is possible to introduce new concepts and rapidly improve the material lot of the villagers by voluntary group action as

[7] Government of India Planning Commission, *Second Five-Year Plan: A Draft Outline* (Government of India Planning Commission 1956), 88 pp.

[8] A Janata College is intended to serve as a training center for village leaders in Social Education.

[9] Government of India Planning Commission, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

opposed to the methods used by totalitarian nations.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Primary education has become part of Fundamental Education. Although some areas do not include primary education in Fundamental Education, in general, the education of the child is looked upon as an important part of the program. There have been objections to the term "primary" as applied to the Fundamental Education schools because, to many, the term signifies purely academic education. Each Fundamental Education school for children is molded to fit the particular needs of the area. The basic elements of the curriculum (reading, writing, arithmetic) are included in all Fundamental Schools, but beyond this skeleton-like outline, the curriculum is based on the needs of the area. Consequently, Fundamental Education primary schools differ not only from one culture to another but also within the area. Because in most areas primary schools were either nonexistent or comparatively weak, the teacher is not bound by centuries of tradition and can, with the cooperation of the local people, plan and build a curriculum for the particular area.

2. There is increasing awareness that "underdeveloped" is a relative term and that the extent of development varies in each area. Unfortunately for the foreign worker in the field of Fundamental Education, not all elements of a culture are at the same level. In the Valle El General of Costa Rica, for example, only 15 per cent of the people were illiterate but there was a high rate of water-borne diseases and infant mortality rate was high. The foreign worker very often finds innumerable local cures for diseases that are as efficient as any that may be imported. On the other hand, he may find that the people do not understand the danger of drinking contaminated water.

In terms of creativity and artistic expression, the people in the so-called underdeveloped areas may be more highly developed than those in industrialized areas. The foreign expert may find a culture in which the people are already working together cooperatively and need merely technical assistance to carry out their projects. Conversely, he may find a rigid class or caste system in which the major work will be that of helping people to work together.

3. In developing Fundamental Education, emphasis must be placed on what people want. The concept of foreign experts deciding what is best for the people of an area and then attempting to raise community support to carry out the idea has, for the most part, been discarded in democratic countries. There are innumerable examples of foreign experts drawing up elaborate plans for communities and then finding that the reaction of the people is negative. The failure of such an approach has led to many clichés, the substance of which is usually that the people were lazy, not interested in self-improvement, or not willing to help themselves. This entire approach is one of treating grownups, often with the very best of intention, like children who have to be led rather than like adults meeting with the expert to solve basic problems cooperatively. The failure of the Anchau Settlement Scheme in Nigeria is a typical example of a well-intentioned community development project that was carried out without the full participation of the people and as a result did not meet the expectations of the planners.

Very often what appears to the foreign expert to be nonessential may be of prime importance to the people. In this case the expert starts with what the people want and thus is able to assist in further development.

4. The people must be able to see results and the results must be realistic in terms of the ability of people and the government to support new projects. While Fundamental Education is primarily a process, it is important that the results of the process, or community development, illustrate graphically what can be accomplished by joint effort. The great danger is that people are sometimes encouraged to undertake projects that are too costly to complete. With the limited financial resources of many governments, much of the cost must be borne by the local people. It is a simple matter, for instance, to increase the fertility of the soil for a short period by adding imported fertilizer. However, the assumption that the people are able to afford imported fertilizer has had disastrous results in many agricultural extension programs. The building of compost piles is a longer process, but it can be done within the economic limitations of the villagers and is sufficient to illustrate the possibilities of increasing production.

While it may be possible to build a maternity clinic, can the salary of a nurse be borne by the village or district? A village may be able to build the school itself and pay the salary of a teacher, but can it afford to pay for equipment and additional teachers when needed? How much can the government help financially? These are examples of actual problems faced by villagers when considering projects.

5. The success of Fundamental Education depends upon the personality, character, and understanding of the experts and the local workers. While experience and knowledge are essential, experienced and learned experts have been known to fail because of their inability to adjust to conditions in underdeveloped societies and because of a lack of understanding of the people whom they are trying to help. Any project is handicapped whose experts lack flexibility and, above all, do not understand the people. One of the greatest problems of Fundamental Education is finding workers who accept and are accepted by the villagers; who understand and respect the culture in which they are working; and who are able to adapt their fields of knowledge to local conditions.

In Asia, in Latin America, in Africa—throughout the world—reports on work in underdeveloped areas, whether they come from UNESCO, United States International Cooperation Administration, colonial governments, or independent governments, stress that the quality of leadership of experts and local workers is of foremost importance in assuring the success of any project. That these concepts are widespread is evident from the following small sampling from a variety of projects.

A general discussion of British policies of Community Development states that the criterion of effectiveness of teams is "sympathy for and knowledge of people which the team possesses."[10]

The training of officers for the Mass Education Center near Rangoon requires a novitiate period to determine their physical and temperamental qualifications for the work. Such workers must have "special qualities of tact, understanding, and selflessness, . . . be willing to go anywhere and live under any conditions."[11]

[10] Batten, *op. cit.*

[11] Ethel Mannin, "Mass Education in Burma," *Community Development Bulletin*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (September 1954), pp. 76-78.

The first work of the gaon-sathi (village companion) of the Allahabad project in India is to "establish a foundation of friendship and confidence among the people" in order to develop the spirit of self-help that will cause them to feel themselves a part in planning and carrying out the work. "Friendship is the very foundation of village work and it is the basis of self-help programs."[12]

In selecting the gaon-sathi, heavy emphasis was placed on their qualities of character. While there was an attempt to recruit those with agricultural experience, they "looked more for character and human approach to villagers and their problems," so academic qualifications were not insisted upon. Older workers with "superior teacher and village uplift patterns" were avoided. An attitude of friendship and humility toward the villagers was considered of utmost importance: "We insist upon an approach founded upon friendship, love and humility towards the peasant . . . the indefinable quality of love."[13]

At a Community Development conference in 1954, the Acting High Commissioner of Malaya stressed the necessity of gaining the confidence of the people by showing a sincere desire to serve by means of talking to them and joining with them in their activities rather than sitting remotely in offices. He considered the most important aspect of an expert's work in teaching people self-reliance was getting close to the people, understanding their problems and helping them to work out solutions.[14] In the selection of a team of locally recruited village leaders in Barotseland Protectorate, "character was more important than paper qualifications."[15]

6. Fundamental Education is a democratic approach to local problems. It places great emphasis on the ability of man to solve his own problems. While it is recognized that technical assistance and grants from governments are necessary to provide those minimum tools necessary for self-improvement, it relies to a large extent on the ability of people to work together in a cooperative manner. It emphasizes the dignity of man. It functions when people meet together and pool their talents and abilities. It relies upon the ability of mature people to discuss their problems together, so that the final effort represents group thinking and group interest. It is diametrically opposed to the Communist and Fascist approach, under which improvement comes about by official decree. In the ideological war of the world today, when large segments of the world's population are hungry and ill-housed, Fundamental Education proves that man can meet the challenge of unfavorable conditions by democratic means.

[12] "Working with the Village People," *Community Development Bulletin*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (June 1955), pp. 58-59.

[13] "India-Village Extension Pilot Project," *Community Development Bulletin*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (March 1954), pp. 31-35.

[14] Hon. D. C. Watherston, "Report on Community Development in the Federation of Malaya," *Community Development Bulletin*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (December 1954), pp. 13-17.

[15] J. G. Lawrence, "The Namushakende Demonstration Team," *Community Development Bulletin*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (June 1954).

American Pragmatism and Education in Review*

H. GORDON HULLFISH

PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

JOHN L. Childs, in his recent volume *American Pragmatism and Education—An Interpretation and Criticism*,[1] has, as the title suggests, placed this philosophy under serious scrutiny.

His effort is timely because in recent years, and especially since the death of John Dewey, the pragmatic philosophy has been under attack from many quarters. Some of the criticism, that from the panderers of hate, for instance, has been unworthy of notice. Some of it has been grounded in an honorable, if insubstantial, attachment to a past that has come under challenge. Some of it has come from those of differing philosophic orientation who, in serious quest for a comprehensive view of man and the universe, have, it seems clear to them, gone beyond what they find to be the earthly limitations of pragmatism. Some of it has arisen among pragmatists themselves in response to questions raised by their serious critics.

Childs's effort is also helpful. Some criticism has been internal, with proponents disagreeing about aspects of their standing ground. It is good to have attention focused upon the fact that a philosophy which stakes its case upon faith in human intelligence to resolve the continuing problems that men confront has to be as sensitive to the doubtful when its own formulations are under scrutiny as it is when doubt arises within other areas of experience. The concept *reconstruction of experience*, central in the thinking of pragmatists as they have sought to improve both educational thought and practice, is not so limited in its meaning that it applies only to the conclusions others reach.

The author in no way suggests it; but this reader, at least, gained a sense that Childs wrote under the compulsion of the tragic note sounded by some of John Dewey's last published words.[2] It is true that in Part One of his book, "The Pragmatic Reconstruction in Philosophy and Education," Childs analyzes the thought of the founders of this philosophy—Charles S. Peirce, William James, John Dewey, and George H. Mead. The fact remains, however, that it is Dewey's thought which is centrally under scrutiny throughout, since, as Childs ob-

* Professor Hullfish, now in his thirty-fourth year of teaching at the Ohio State University, is currently executive secretary-treasurer of The John Dewey Society. He writes the column "Forces Affecting American Education" which appears monthly in *Educational Leadership*.

[1] New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1956.

[2] In his Introduction to *The Use of Resources in Education*, by Elsie Ripley Clapp (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1952).

serves, "Dewey alone lived through the second quarter of the twentieth century." In addition, it was Dewey, convinced that "we can best discover the *moral* significance of any particular philosophical view by exploring its consequences for the education of the young," who brought to the fore a consideration of educational problems, and by the publication of *Democracy and Education* inspired so many in education to undertake its reconstruction. Yet, as he suggested in introducing Miss Clapp's writing, he realized that inspiration may often be captured by habit and reduced to the routine it has promised to abolish.

> To change long-established habits in the individual is a slow, difficult and complicated process. To change long-established institutions—which are social habits organized in the structure of the common life—is a much slower, more difficult and far more complicated process. The drive of established institutions is to assimilate and to distort the new into conformity with themselves. This drive or tendency in the educational institution is perhaps most glaringly evident in the way the ideas and principles of the educational philosophy I have had a share in developing are still for the most part taught, more than half a century after they began to find their way in various parts of the school. *In teachers colleges and elsewhere the ideas and principles have been converted into a fixed subject matter of ready-made rules, to be taught and memorized according to certain standardized procedures* and, when occasion arises, to be applied to educational problems externally, the way mustard plasters, for example, are applied.[8] (Italics are present author's.)

Childs presents no mustard plasters which either philosophers or educators may keep on hand for daily use. His is not, in fact, a how-to-do interest. His first concern is to discover the *why* of "the pragmatic temper and mode of thinking," tracing it from its American beginnings in Peirce, through James to Dewey and Mead, and viewing it all the while in relationship to its distinctive cultural roots. He finds that "pragmatism is a *criticism* as well as an *expression* of operating American habits of life and thought . . . a reflection and an evaluation of American culture . . . an embodiment of democratic and scientific values inherent in our national life . . . a program for the reconstruction of received patterns that are not in harmony with these values" (page 11). He is too wise, however, to stake the claim of pragmatism exclusively on American soil. Its founders, in and of America as they were, were nevertheless "intellectually at home in the tradition of Western philosophy." This tradition, however, was challenged by the many problems that arose in American life "as a result of the impact of scientific and social developments" and, in the estimation of these founders, nothing short of the "reconstruction of the Western philosophical tradition" itself would help man in his "intellectual and moral orientation."

These conclusions are meticulously documented throughout Part One, which comprises almost one-half of the volume. Indeed, the reader in a hurry may wish the documentation were less complete. But Childs, obviously, did not address himself to such a reader. One can almost hear him saying as he wrote, "It is haste, haste to get things done, to change methods, to revise curricula, that has led to the 'ready-made rules' which disturbed Mr. Dewey. And it is haste that has led to those excesses that have at times made pragmatism the legitimate target of the critic. Let's have no more of this. Let's see clearly what the leading ideas of the philosophy are. Let's under-

[8] Clapp, *op. cit.*, p. x.

stand their consequences. We may discover that in reaching for a gadget we denied what we basically believe." Childs, in effect, invites his readers to choose a position he finds good; at the same time, however, he invites them to tarry with him while he makes certain he has made no mistake in choosing as he has. Education would be greatly helped were many in the profession to accept this invitation to participate reflectively in his exploration of his standing ground.

Those who do accept this invitation will discover that the pragmatic emphases in education—the emphases upon experimental method, upon the development of reflective thought, upon the release of intelligence, and, as Joseph K. Hart put it, upon the readiness to trust "the intelligence of tomorrow to meet the problems of tomorrow"—all stem in large measure from the effort of Charles S. Peirce to clarify the conditions under which serious inquiry is initiated (he noted the need for the presence of "a real and living doubt") and to set forth those characteristics of inquiry that lead to "objectivity in the development of meaning and knowledge." Experimental method had had cultural consequences, and Peirce reflected upon its meaning for the critical activities of establishing belief and of making ideas clear. Here lies part of the pragmatic ground, revealed further in the thought of James, Dewey, and Mead.

The reader will discover, also, that a naturalistic point of view pervades the pragmatic philosophy—that dualistic conceptions are rejected; that life is said to be marked by change, novelty, and uncertainty; that thinking is viewed as a natural occurrence, intelligence being simply "a distinctive kind of acting or behaving"; that mind is held to emerge from an organic base and selfhood to result from the interactions, or transactions, of the organism and its environment, with neither being given full-blown in advance of experience; that growth is set forth as the supreme end of education and that the human relationships forecast by the democratic aspiration are believed to hold the maximum of promise for providing a superior quality of experience to all men; that, according to Childs's presentation of Dewey's view of the case for the democratic preference and criterion, "the ultimate seat of moral authority resides within the community of shared interests and activities in and through which individual human beings live and move and work out their personal careers" (page 129); and that, though "democracy is neither the child of science nor of pragmatism" (page 140), it is believed that the realization of the implications of both science and pragmatism in the reconstruction of education will enhance the achievement of democracy.

This, of course, presents but the bare bones of this portion of the book. Specifically, it neglects the author's continuing concern to note, not in detail, to be sure, but in incisive and illuminating comments, the educational significance of the pragmatic contentions. After noting, for instance, the "dependence of human minds upon culture," he cautions those who, from the same philosophic orientation, plan to make educative use of "pupil initiative in purposeful inquiries," reminding them that they "serve neither the cause of human civilization nor the cause of the growth of the young" when they assume that "transmission of meaning is less important than the discovery of new meaning in the nurture of the young." "One of the most important problems in the making of the curriculum," he adds, "is to develop a

program that will bring the process of transmission and acquisition of meaning and the process of inquiry and discovery of meaning into the most fruitful relationship" (page 73).

In Part Two of his book, titled "Pragmatism and the New Education," Childs examines the educational proposals of three distinguished pragmatists, William H. Kilpatrick, George S. Counts, and Boyd H. Bode; re-examines the pragmatic theory of education, especially its implications for the knotty problem of indoctrination, its emphasis upon the concept of growth (including the fact that growing always occurs in relationship to a specific culture, never in a social vacuum), and its reputed inability, according to the authors of *The Discipline of Practical Judgment in a Democratic Society*,[4] to prepare the young "to meet the demands of our democratic civilization"; devotes a chapter to a consideration of certain questions raised in the field of religion by the advent of pragmatism, in particular whether the pragmatist may be a theist; and, finally, sums his discussion by a consideration of the future of American education in the light of the pragmatic philosophy he has so ably presented. The title for this section was not lightly chosen. Childs speaks always of *the new education*, never of *progressive education*. In fact, progressive education is mentioned but three times in the book—once in a quotation from Dewey, once in a quotation from Counts, and once when Childs refers to those who wrote of "the discipline of practical judgment" as "a group of progressive educators who are in general accord with the pragmatic point of view." Childs is probably right in avoiding this label. Progressive education was not invented by the pragmatists. Nor, it may be argued, was the new education. At issue here is education as viewed by certain pragmatists, including Childs.

Whatever the designation, the educational proposals made by Kilpatrick, Counts, and Bode look forward to a reconstruction of education that recognizes the method of reflective experience as the method of learning and that exemplifies democracy at its best. All of this Childs makes clear, while noting a distinctive emphasis upon the part of each of these pragmatists. Kilpatrick has emphasized "the importance of the wholehearted purposeful act in the education of the young" (page 193); Counts expresses belief that we will best grasp the essence of our organized education if we conceive it as the deliberate effort of adults to introduce their young to the folkways and the thoughtways of their civilization" (page 241); and Bode, critical of those who seek educational direction from child needs or interests, and of the resulting incidental approach to the gaining of knowledge and skills, has focused upon the release of intelligence and the steady extension of common concerns as a way of restoring wholeness both to individuals and to the culture, thus seeking "to blend the democratic and experimental outlooks into an integrated theory of educational practice" (page 268).

The summaries of these positions are tightly formulated and generally adequate. On this score, Professors Kilpatrick and Counts may speak for themselves. As for Professor Bode, I would suggest that his view has a meaning for educational method and the curriculum pattern which Childs has not pointed up. It is true that Bode did not toss out subject matter, fearful perhaps that the

[4] R. Bruce Raup, George Axtelle, Kenneth Benne, and B. Othanel Smith (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1950).

baby would be thrown out with the bath water. He expected subjects to be taught in a way that would illuminate life as it was being lived, and as it had been lived; he expected a subject to secure "a wide variety of educational goods," having no notion that all students in a class would derive identical learnings; he anticipated that students would become acquainted "with the main things that should be taken into account, as based on the experience of the race, so that they may have a proper sense of values when they are called upon to make their own decisions," and it is in this sense, he believed, "that we can provide a general education."[5]

Childs has not written a book that will stop discussion among the pragmatists, or eliminate their differences. The position is so constituted as to make the achievement of these ends forever impossible. But two achievements should be facilitated. The uncritical educational practitioner should be brought to realize the commitments of his actions; and those critics of pragmatic educational proposals who blandly announce that here is an educational philosophy devoid of directing ideals should find a pathway to graciousness smoothed for them.

As for discussion, the proponents of "the discipline of practical judgment" may want a further word. Childs has made a sound analysis of this position, noting its weakness in the criticisms advanced against scientific method, on the one hand, and against the efficacy of compromise, on the other. Yet its sponsors may wonder when Childs, in discussing the consequences for educational practice of Dewey's recognition of the initiating function of the problem in reflective inquiry, equates the problem approach with research, whether he is not guilty of presenting a narrow view of research in quite the same way he charges that they put forward a narrow view of scientific method. What Childs is concerned to demonstrate is that there are many things in civilization that are "not problematical in any vital sense, and yet they need to be communicated to the young" (page 355). He distinguishes, therefore, a research function from an educational function. The former deals with the discovery of meaning; the latter, with communication and acquisition —with the changes that take place "in the habits, appreciations, meanings, and attitudes of the young" (page 356).

It is true that there is much that is stable in our civilization. It is true that "the body of subject matter which should be transmitted to the young is broader than that which is involved in the tensional, disturbed life situations of a human group" (page 355). It is also true, as Childs does not suggest, since he is looking at the state of the culture rather than at the state of the individual learning, that in any situation of inquiry the doubtful elements are specific. If total situations were doubtful, if no parts were meaningful, inquiry could not go forward. Childs is properly disturbed by the way in which some within the pragmatic orientation have launched wholesale attacks upon subject matter. The philosophy provides no warrant for such attacks. Yet the fact remains that he moved into this discussion from a consideration of Dewey's contention that "the essentials of educational method are identical with the essentials of reflection." Teachers are responsible for selecting from all the knowledge man has accumulated that which is essential for effective participation within the civili-

[5] Boyd H. Bode, *Fundamentals of Education* (New York, Modern Teacher's Series, 1921), pp. 14-15.

zation they represent. They are equally responsible for creating situations for the student in which what they deem to be essential *becomes* essential to the developing experience of the student, a point made long ago by Dewey.[6] In this sense, to learn, to achieve meaningfulness within experience is all one with learning to think. Childs has a better ground than he has here used to establish his valid point that the school should be concerned with more than the doubtful, tensional situations of adult life.

The chapter in which the author considers pragmatism and religion will probably cause a spate of discussion, at least among pragmatists. He rejects, as of course he must, all that is dogmatic or authoritative. Asserting, however, that his considerations reveal that "a method of conducting inquiries, not a special system of metaphysicial doctrine, is foundational in pragmatism" (page 329), he edges toward the conclusion that to be a pragmatist does not necessarily cut one off from the possibility of being a theist, a position many pragmatists would not take and one which John Dewey did not take. Childs does not wish to see a method of inquiry "dogmatically converted into a completed system of metaphysics" (page 335); nor does he, as he reveals in the final chapter, wish to see the educational and cultural gains he is sure may be attributed to the growth of the pragmatic philosophy lost as adherents of "final truths" engage in unyielding battle, with a fruitful method of inquiry they might share lost beyond recall. He knows that good men do not always see eye to eye. He hopes that, so far as our public schools are concerned, we may be wise enough, turning our backs on all that is dogmatic, to give vitality in our shared educational undertakings to the principle of "live and help live." This generous gesture he draws from the philosophical orientation he has so thoughtfully explored.

[6] John Dewey, *The Child and the Curriculum* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1902), pp. 29-30.

Teachers College, Columbia University Register of Doctoral Dissertations

ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Volume IV, Second Annual Supplement

July 1, 1955—June 30, 1956

VOLUMES I and II of the *Register of Doctoral Dissertations*, covering the years 1899-1941, are now out of print. Volume III,* 1942-1946, and volume IV,† 1947-1953, may be purchased from the Bureau of Publications, Teachers College.

This *Register* does not include project reports submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the Doctor of Education degree. Two volumes of the *Register of Doctor of Education Reports*, volume I, 1935–March 1, 1945 and volume II, March 1945–December 1951, are available from the Bureau of Publications, Teachers College.

75. STEINBRENNER, ARTHUR HENRY
A study of the concept of continuity for teachers of secondary school mathematics. Microfilm, 1955.

76. MACCOBY, HERBERT HENRY
The relationship between participation in the community self-help association and participation in political activity. Microfilm, 1955.

77. BACHRACH, PAUL B.
The relationship between social class identification and attitudes towards occupational expectancies. Microfilm, 1955.

78. KAPLAN, HELEN SINGER
The effects of alcohol on fear extinction. Microfilm, 1955.

79. WALKER, JOHN HAROLD
The relationships between consistency of attitude toward the self and personal adjustment. Microfilm, 1956.

80. HESCH, MARY ELIZABETH BEAMAN
The nature of mathematical evidence and its significance for the teaching of secondary school mathematics. Microfilm, 1955.

81. ROSENTHAL, SHELDON
Correlates of attitudes among clinical psychology students. Microfilm, 1955.

82. MELIKIAN, LEVON HAGOP
Some correlates of authoritarianism in two cultural groups. Microfilm, 1956.

83. JENSEN, ARTHUR ROBERT
Aggression in fantasy and overt behavior. Microfilm, 1956.

84. BELTH, MARC
The concept of democracy in Dewey's theory of education. Microfilm, 1956.

85. KLEIN, ARMIN
The influence of stimulus material and geographical region on responses to a thematic test. Microfilm, 1956.

* $0.50 † $0.60

86. Freid, Jacob Hansel
The log cabin symbol in American presidential politics. Microfilm, 1956.

87. Counts, Martha Louise
The political views of the eighteenth-century New England clergy as expressed in their election sermons. Microfilm, 1956.

88. Wolff, Frank Arnold
Self-parent similarity of high school girls in relation to teachers' judgments. Microfilm, 1956.

89. Burkhart, Sarah Maybelle
A study of concept learning in differential calculus. Microfilm, 1956.

90. Mann, John Harvey
The influence of racial prejudice on sociometric choices and preceptions. Microfilm, 1956.

91. Coyle, John Emerson
Counselor prediction of academic success. Microfilm, 1956.

92. Vayhinger, John Monroe
Prediction from the Rorschach of behavior in a group situation. Microfilm, 1956.

93. Okarski, Joseph Frank
Consistency of projective movement responses. Microfilm, 1956.

94. Orr, David Bram
The distance measure as a statistic for clustering jobs. Microfilm, 1956.

95. Richter, Marion Cecelia Rae
Drawing and learning in biology: the relationship between pupils' drawings of visual aids and their learning in biology. Microfilm, 1956.

96. Wagner, Nathaniel Ned
The performance of schizophrenic individuals with high and low levels of anxiety following frustration. Microfilm, 1956.

97. Shapiro, David Sidney
Perceptions of significant family and environmental relationships in aggressive and withdrawn children. Microfilm, 1956.

98. Bortner, Morton Zane
Forming impressions of persons from reading material. Microfilm, 1956.

99. Furno, Orlando Frederick
The projection of school quality from expenditure level. Microfilm, 1956.

100. Afzal, Manuchehr
The cultural setting of the problems of teacher training in Iran. Microfilm, 1956.

101. Gold, Donald Lee
The effect of negative instructions on Rorschach symbolization. Microfilm, 1956.

102. Berger, Morris Isaiah
The settlement, the immigrant and the public school: a study of the influence of the settlement movement and the new migration upon public education, 1890-1924. Microfilm, 1956.

103. Weston, Miriam Yvonne Drake
Mother and son descriptions of mothers and sons in a picture story test. Microfilm, 1956.

104. Dhairyam, Desaraj
Personality differences between a Hindu and an American group. Microfilm, 1956.

105. Pitt, Clifford Caplin Vivian
An experimental study of the effects of teachers' knowledge or incorrect knowledge of pupil I. Q.'s on teachers' attitudes and practices and pupils' attitudes and achievement. Microfilm, 1956.

106. London, Perry
Developmental aspects of discrimination in relation to adjustment. Microfilm, 1956.

107. Kapit, Hanna Elizabeth Eliza-Husserl
Relationships between attitudes toward therapist and attitudes toward parents. Microfilm, 1956.

108. FIFER, GORDON
Estimation of item difficulty. Microfilm, 1956.

109. DAVIS, JUNIUS AYERS
Returns sought from adult work by early adolescents in relation to sociometric status among peers. Microfilm, 1956.

110. GRUNES, MARK
Some aspects of conscience and their relationship to intelligence. Microfilm, 1956.

AUTHOR INDEX

The numbers refer to items in the Register, not to pages.

Afzal, Manuchehr, 100

Bachrach, P. B., 77
Belth, Marc, 84
Berger, M. I., 102
Bortner, M. Z., 98
Burkhart, S. M., 89

Counts, M. L., 87
Coyle, J. E., 91

Davis, J. A., 109
Dhairyam, Desaraj, 104

Fifer, Gordon, 108
Freid, J. H., 86
Furno, O. F., 99

Gold, D. L., 101
Grunes, Mark, 110

Hesch, M. E. B., 80

Jensen, A. R., 83

Kapit, H. E. E.-H., 107
Kaplan, H. S., 78
Klein, Armin, 85

London, Perry, 106

Maccoby, H. H., 76
Mann, J. H., 90
Melikian, L. H., 82

Okarski, J. F., 93
Orr, D. B., 94

Pitt, C. C. V., 105

Richter, M. C. R., 95
Rosenthal, Sheldon, 81

Shapiro, D. S., 97
Steinbrenner, A. H., 75

Vayhinger, J. M., 92

Wagner, N. N., 96
Walker, J. H., 79
Weston, M. Y. D., 103
Wolff, F. A., 88

REVIEWS

Mark Hopkins and the Log, by Frederick Rudolph. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1956. xiv + 267 pp. $4.75.

Neilson of Smith, by Margaret Farrand Thorp. New York, Oxford University Press, 1956. xxv + 363 pp. $7.00.

Everyone has heard James A. Garfield's definition of an ideal college: "Mark Hopkins on one end of a log, and a student on the other." Few realize that the tribute was paid during a controversy in which the man who had been president of Williams College for a generation was under bitter attack and the college itself was in dangerous decline. Even fewer have any idea what either Hopkins or Williams was like during the period of his leadership. Professor Rudolph tells us in a book which, although he is now on the Williams staff, betrays little admiration for either subject.

Hopkins was made president of his alma mater in 1836 *faute de mieux*. Thirty-four years of age, he had been professor of moral and intellectual philosophy since 1830, but he was far from being a philosopher in any scholarly sense of that term. Indeed, he was far from being a scholar of any sort. He had once read a few pages of Kant, enough to discover that Kant was incomprehensible to him. But reading was an exercise in which he rarely indulged, except when the excitements of the Civil War drove him briefly to the newspapers. He found it quite possible to refute Hume, Darwin, and Huxley without bothering to find out what they had to say.

Hopkins was not even learned in the realm of theology, although he was ordained as a Congregational minister on the day of his inauguration and became a much sought-after lecturer on religious topics. His piety was little disturbed by doctrine. The instruction he offered to Williams seniors throughout his thirty-six years as president and for the fifteen years of his life thereafter was little concerned with the intellect. His interest was in the formation of "character"; his aim—announced as he took office—was to run "a *safe* college."

For a long time Hopkins' attitude and ambition appeared admirable to his trustees and his faculty, only one or two of whom were men of any intellectual eminence. The classical course of study was taught in so dull and dispirited a fashion that few liberal values can have been realized. G. Stanley Hall's verdict on his undergraduate years at Williams in the 1860's is devastating. Religion was the dominant note, with prayer meetings at sunrise, prayer meetings at noontide, prayer meetings in the evening, and revival meetings whenever they could be whipped up, that is every few years or so.

Yet change was taking place, change to which Hopkins adjusted—he was really no man to take a stand—although it usually made him uneasy. Thus the world entered the Williamstown wilderness in the form of students from the cities, and consolidated its position through the establishment of Greek letter fraternities. Practical interests pressed for attention, first expressing themselves through extracurricular student activities, as in the realm of scientific inquiry, but slowly influencing the course of study. Organized athletics were developed by the undergraduates. The alumni formed an association and began to push their ideas. Toward the end of Hopkins' presidential regime he found himself doubtfully hiring professors with scholarly training. The revolution was at hand.

As an administrator Hopkins proved, in

the end, to be a failure. Following the Civil War the fortunes of Williams declined precipitously, while those of other New England colleges were rising. The benefactions of Amos Lawrence, Boston merchant and great admirer of Hopkins, helped, as did the somewhat unexpected largesse of the Great and General Court of Massachusetts in 1868. But the students were by then in rebellion, the faculty disaffected, and the trustees shaken. Hopkins resigned just in time. He was to teach at Williams for fifteen more years, observing subsequent developments resignedly but without enthusiasm, continuing to promote the formation of "character" and leaving the cultivation of the intellect to those who erroneously considered it important.

William Allan Neilson, born in Scotland three years before Hopkins retired and four years before the founding of Smith College—of which he was to become president in 1917—always believed that intellect *was* important. He was also concerned with the development of "personalities." A graduate of Edinburgh, he early emigrated to Canada whence, after a few years of schoolmastering, he moved to Harvard. There he took his Ph.D. in English in 1898. A year of teaching at Bryn Mawr—where he learned to despise that astonishing woman, President M. Carey Thomas—followed. Then appointments at Harvard, Columbia, and Harvard again. Mrs. Thorp's book, however, emphasizes his twenty-two years at Smith where, for a season during his administration, she was Director of Publicity and Assistant Professor of English. Her admiration for her subject is enormous, but she is not cloying. As a writer, her skill considerably surpasses that of Professor Rudolph.

Neilson differed enormously from Hopkins. He was cultivated and urbane. He possessed charm and wit. Religious in the best sense of the term, he adhered to no denomination. He liked whiskey and cigars. He was active in reform movements, whereas Hopkins never got involved even in the slavery issue! He was a scholar.

In fact Neilson was so excellent a scholar that all his friends, beginning with Charles W. Eliot, advised him not to accept the offer that came to him from Smith when he was forty-eight years old. His editions of Shakespeare had established a solid reputation. He had assisted Eliot—perhaps borne the major burden—in producing *The Harvard Classics*. He was, after he went to Smith, to become editor of *Webster's New International Dictionary*. He was a brilliant teacher.

Yet Neilson chose to turn to administration, and in administration, he was also a remarkable success, at least after some original fumbling. He built a faculty of outstanding quality and *esprit de corps*. He encouraged liberalization of the liberal arts curriculum without promoting any new "plans"—he was skeptical of "plans." He ran the college with a minimum of administrative fuss, feathers, and machinery, relying heavily on the skillful aides he so carefully selected. He was adored by the Smith students, with whom he kept in close touch and whom he treated as persons. He encouraged the alumnae to maintain an active interest in their college but never yielded to excited pressure from that quarter when, for example, there was occasional demand that shocking professors' heads should roll. As chairman of his own board of trustees he commanded support as warm as it was undeviating. He enlarged and beautified the campus, both architecturally and in terms of landscaping.

But with all this activity Neilson found time, too, for the expression of wider interests. Adult education and mental hygiene were causes in which he was influentially concerned. He devoted energy to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was for several years (before 1934) honorary president of the Institute for Cultural Relations with Russia, and was not afraid to show his sympathy with Sacco and Vanzetti. He was active in various associations and foundations concerned with the improvement of higher education. To such causes he turned his full attention during the years between his re-

tirement in 1934 and his death seven years later.

One puts these books down wondering what the conversation would have been like if Neilson had ever found himself on the other end of Hopkins' log! One turns away from them wondering what the college president of the twenty-first century will be like!

KARL W. BIGELOW
Teachers College, Columbia

Education and Sociology, by Emile Durkheim. Translation and introduction by Sherwood D. Fox. Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1956. 163 pp. $3.50.

Half a century ago Emile Durkheim, the eminent French sociologist, was appointed to the chair of Science of Education at the Sorbonne. He had already won recognition for his publications on sociological method, suicide, and the analysis of the social divisions of labor. These and his subsequent publications have had a major impact on English and American sociological thinking. Curiously enough, however, Durkheim's academic career was devoted almost entirely to the teaching of pedagogics, an area in which he published nothing which has attracted attention comparable to that aroused by his other studies. It seems fair to say that his influence on American education has been negligible, partly because his writings have been unavailable, partly because the psychological orientation of American education excluded competing conceptual systems, and partly because the existing spirit of the times, with its emphasis upon the individual and social reform, did not provide a congenial environment for the development of a social science of education. But times have changed, and one evidence of this fact is the expanded influence of Durkheim's approach within American sociology. It is reasonable to expect that this increased influence will find itself reflected in those areas of education with which social science is concerned, and for this reason, if for no other, the translation of and introduction to *Education and Sociology* by Sherwood D. Fox is welcomed.

The present volume was first issued in Paris in 1922. It consisted of four articles (published between 1903 and 1911) which were collected and introduced by Paul Fauconnet. These essays do not constitute a definitive analysis of the sociology of education. They represent, in fact, the application to education of basic sociological and scientific insights of other studies.

Perhaps the most important question with which we should concern ourselves is the relevance of Durkheim's position to current educational thinking. But before we can do this it is necessary to summarize briefly the problems he considered. It was his contention that the ends of education are wholly social and consist of the influence of adults upon youth. He writes, "Its object is to arouse and to develop in the child a certain number of physical, intellectual and moral states which are demanded of him by both the political society as a whole and the special milieu for which he is specifically destined." But he rejects as a fallacy that there is an ideal education equally applicable to all men. Since societies vary in time and place, so also must education vary to meet the needs of the society. Hence education is also a function of time and place. "Education is, then, only the means by which society prepares, within the children, the essential conditions of its very existence." Education does not perfect the inherent capabilities of each individual, but is "faced with a *tabula rasa*" and must create "in man a new being." Nor can education be outside "the conditions of normal life," for it must assure that the community of ideas and sentiments, themselves the product of a common life with historic causes, are transmitted to oncoming generations. The State has a paramount interest in the process, since collective life is impossible if education is on an individual or family basis. The educator must recognize the serious nature of his task, which

demands a sense of duty and dignity and an appreciation of his moral authority and purpose as an agent of society.

Durkheim recognized three aspects of the educative process: the practice of education, the scientific study of its genesis and function, and pedagogy. He concluded that since we lack an adequate science of education, pedagogy must carry the burden of presenting practical theories and programs. Their purpose should not be to preach what should be, a characteristic of so much contemporary pedagogy, nor to describe the nature of things, but through reflection upon knowledge and experience to orient educational practices and to direct their creative functions. An adequate pedagogy is based upon history, an understanding of current social movements, and the methods of psychology for transmitting pedagogical ideals.

These ideals, however, can be explained only through understanding the social structure. It is society which creates the model which educators must reproduce. Thus it is to sociology, Durkheim reasons, that educators must turn to gain the knowledge and understanding of the common ideas and sentiments which it is their responsibility to transmit.

The appraisal of the relevance of Durkheim's ideas to current educational practice and pedagogy is beset with some difficulties. Very great progress has been made in some dimensions of education since he wrote, a half-century ago. Some of these changes were anticipated in his writings. Pedagogy, however, continues to exhibit many of the same characteristics about which he complained. In addition, we have made only limited progress toward a science of education. His basic concepts of the relation between education and society remain to be proved. Their validation is dependent upon types of research not yet realized. For this reason, if for no other, Durkheim's theories should become understood by American educators, for they provide significant orientation for modern education.

SOLON T. KIMBALL
Teachers College, Columbia

How to Get Better Schools, by David B. Dreiman. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1956. xvii + 267 pp. $3.50.

The history of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools is the inspiring story of dedicated Americans working together for the cause of public education. The amazing record of their achievements might well be taken as evidence that the Commission had become, as James Bryant Conant declared in 1949 it could become, "the most important move for the advancement of public education taken in the last fifty years." *How to Get Better Schools* records this significant contemporary development in American public education.

In a deeper sense, however, this book does much more than just chronicle the important work of the National Citizens Commission in the field of education; it demonstrates the simple truth that the citizen in a democracy can still make a mighty contribution to the solution of public problems. In an age when man feels unable to cope with his social problems, this is an important demonstration.

Since its beginnings the Citizens Commission has had great faith in the intelligence, willingness, and power of the average citizen to solve his school problems. Roy E. Larsen, chairman of the Commission, explains in the Foreword to this book that the Commission recognized in the beginning that its success hinged entirely upon its ability to arouse local citizen activity in bettering public education. In his words, the Commission was to be "a catalytic agent, a clearinghouse, an encourager of independent, democratic action." Proof that the Commission's faith in the average citizen was not unfounded is seen in Part I of this book, where Dreiman describes the encouraging results of citizen action in the school systems of Corning, New York; Minneapolis, Minnesota; New Canaan, Connecticut; Houston, Texas; and Bellevue, Washington.

From the efforts of these and many thousands of other communities, the National

Citizens Commission has learned a great deal about the art of building better schools. One of the chief values of *How to Get Better Schools* is that it reveals the secrets of this newly discovered art in such careful detail that any group of citizens now can take with confidence the steps necessary to get better schools in their community. Here are found the tested and proved techniques they can use in wrestling with problems related to organizing local and state citizens' committees, conducting winning campaigns for more school support, working with school boards, and getting enough good teachers, classrooms, and teaching materials, and enough money to pay for these educational items. Dreiman has drawn these tested methods for citizen action from the fifteen Working Guides that the Commission published. Though much of the descriptive material and the excellent illustrations in the original Guides had to be omitted, the essential facts are here, making this, in the reviewer's opinion, the most valuable, compact, do-it-yourself handbook available on the subject of "how to get better schools."

Certainly if ever a book deserved the widest possible audience, this one does. Great and serious problems still face our public schools. Americans everywhere must help to meet these continuing educational challenges. And as Dreiman reminds us, this is not just a struggle over schools; it is really a battle for the very preservation of our democratic way of life. How is freedom to survive and democracy to be made secure, he asks, without a rich and vital education to nourish them? To the extent, therefore, that citizens are willing and able to assume their responsibilities in promoting public education, to that extent will the future of both our schools and our democracy be secure. *How to Get Better Schools* makes an important contribution at this time by inspiring in Americans the will to assume these responsibilities.

RICHARD K. SECKINGER
Bethune-Cookman College

Books Received for Review

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, "Issues Before the Eleventh General Assembly," *International Conciliation*, No. 510.

Davies, Rupert E. (ed.), *An Approach to Christian Education* (A symposium). New York, Philosophical Library, 1956. 159 pp. $4.75.

Durrell, Donald D., *Improving Reading Instruction*. Yonkers, World Book Co., 1956. 402 pp.

Edelston, H., *Problems of Adolescents*. New York, Philosophical Library, 1956. 174 pp. $4.75.

Engelhardt, N. L. and Engelhardt, N. L. Jr., Leggett, Stanton, *School Planning and Building Handbook*. New York, Dodge Books, 1956. 626 pp. $12.75.

Financing Education in the Public Schools. A Symposium Conducted by the Tax Institute, Princeton, N. J., 1956. 183 pp. $5.00.

Hall, Robert K. and Lauwerys, J. A. (eds.), *Education and Economics*. The Yearbook of Education. Yonkers, World Book Co. 595 pp.

Hindle, Brooke, *The Pursuit of Science in Revolutionary America*, 1735-1789. Chapel Hill, N. C., The University of North Carolina Press. 410 pp. $7.50.

Hutchins, Robert M., *Freedom, Education, and the Fund*. Essays and Addresses, 1946-56. New York, Meridian Books, 1956. 241 pp. $1.25.

Jorgenson, Lloyd P., *The Founding of Public Education in Wisconsin*. Madison, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1956. 252 pp.

Love, Donald M., *Henry Churchill King of Oberlin*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1956. 300 pp. $4.50.

Marrou, H. I. (Translated by George Lamb), *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Sheed and Ward: New York, 1956. 466 pp. $7.50.

Nathan, Beatrice Stephens, *Tales of a Teacher*. Chicago, Henry Regnery Co., 1956. 302 pp. $4.00.

Osborne, Ernest G., *Understanding Your Parents*. New York, Association Press, 1956. 122 pp. $1.75.

Schonell, F. Eleanor, *Educating Spastic Children*. New York, Philosophical Library. 242 pp. $6.00.

Producing Opera in the College

LOUIS H. HUBER

A NEEDED addition to the material now available on a subject of growing interest. *Producing Opera in the College* constitutes a handbook on this subject, from initial steps to final performance. The author has drawn on his experience as conductor and producer of college and community opera to provide practical information and suggestions on all aspects of college opera: management, financing, publicity, coaching, coordinating drama and music, conducting, lighting, set design. Dr. Huber's brief history of opera in college is illuminating, and the detailed analysis he offers of ten operas that are particularly suitable for college use and yet are seldom heard in America is interesting and helpful. *128 pages Illustrated* $3.75

BUREAU OF PUBLICATIONS
TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK 27

CASE STUDIES IN COLLEGE STUDENT-STAFF RELATIONSHIPS

Edited by ESTHER LLOYD-JONES, RUTH BARRY, AND BEVERLY WOLF

A collection of 22 sketches of critical moments in campus relationships. Vividly portrayed in brief, well-written case studies are various administrative officers, faculty members, students, and members of the community. The reader becomes an active participant in the case situations, as he ponders *what* should be done, *how*, and *by whom* to improve relationships on the campus. Each case study is followed by a group of questions designed to initiate discussion, challenge prejudices, and stimulate constructive thought. *117 pages Paper* $2.00

CASE STUDIES IN HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS IN SECONDARY SCHOOL

Edited by ESTHER LLOYD-JONES, RUTH BARRY, AND BEVERLY WOLF

The 26 situational case studies in this book are based upon actual incidents in junior and senior high schools and lend themselves to either individual or group study. Questions following the case studies will stimulate discussion about the pressures and motivations of the individuals in each instance.

This realistically written book is designed to enable all members of a school community to work together toward more wisdom and insight for the situations they must face.

135 pages Paper $2.00

Series in Guidance and Student Personnel Administration

BUREAU OF PUBLICATIONS
Teachers College, Columbia University, New York 27

A NEW BASIS OF SUPPORT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

THAD L. HUNGATE
CONTROLLER, TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA

The author sets up objective measures of *actual* support and *ability to finance* higher education in the states—measures which enable the reader to:

.....see clearly the level of institutional current support for higher education of youth in the states.
.....compare state patterns of support sources.
.....contrast the effort exerted in the various states to support higher education for youth.
.....see bases for federal aid to equalize opportunities for higher education.

Part I of the study presents the background of the problem, a broad overview of current practice, a summary and interpretation of the issues emerging from the analysis, and proposals for action. Part II sets forth in text, summarizing tables, and charts the statistics on effort and support by states. In the Appendices are twelve master tables upon which the presentation of Part II rests.

Paper bound $1.50

BUREAU OF PUBLICATIONS
Teachers College, Columbia University, New York 27

INDIVIDUALIZING READING INSTRUCTION IN THE CLASSROOM.

Script by IRENE VITE. Supervision by ALICE MIEL, Teachers College, Columbia. 2 reels, 16 mm., black and white. $90.00*

Shows first graders making rapid progress in learning to read through an individualized approach. Four readers have their time alone with the teacher—a time to read from books they have selected—while the other children in the class proceed with an activity period of their own planning. The audience sees how the teacher tests the four children's grasp of main ideas, helps with word attack and phonics, and encourages fluency in oral reading.

This film will prove especially helpful to elementary school teachers (pre-service and in-service), reading specialists, curriculum workers, administrators, and parents.

Produced by

BUREAU OF PUBLICATIONS
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York 27, N. Y.

* *To rent a print* of this film, consult your local educational film library.